SACRAMENTS AND SOCIETY

A Study of the Origin and Value of Rites in Religion

ALLAN WORTHINGTON COOKE

BOSTON
RICHARD G. BADGER, PUBLISHER
THE GORHAM PRESS

The Gorham Press, Boston, U. S. A.

Printed in the United States of America

TO

GEORGE HERBERT MEAD

IN GRATEFUL APPRECIATION OF

A DEBT WHICH I CAN

NEVER REPAY

PREFACE

CIRCUMSTANCES connected with the World War have prevented the earlier publication of the material herein presented, though the manuscript was prepared in June, 1915, and submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Literature of the University of Chicago in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Not having read the manuscript during these nine years, I have returned to it with some measure of discreteness and feel that I can introduce it with less of personal prejudice, though with even more firm conviction, than I could have done at the time it was written.

There is a good deal of illustrative material which might have been summarized or omitted, but it all contributes to the building up of the argument and when I was elaborating the thesis set forth, I felt that I must establish it on as broad a foundation as possible, culled from the published findings of competent and recognized observers in the field of primitive social customs. Had it been possible to recast the material, there is also much that might have been added, but it seemed incumbent on me to publish the material as it stood.

The intervening years appear to me to have increased rather than diminished whatever interest there may attach to the thesis herein set forth, that Sacraments are an indispensable element in religion. We have seen, as one result of the destruction of war, a break down of many of the long established social sanctions, and a reviving insistence on the necessity of religion as one of the most potent agencies for social control. There has been for years a growing desire for something real in the way of corporate reunion of the various religious organizations which constitute Christendom,

and some of these bodies have been suffering of late in the throes of controversy as to what do and what do not constitute the essentials in Christian *doctrine,* while if my thesis be correct, doctrine itself is of secondary importance and the really necessary thing is the mystic ritual of the Sacraments.

A Preface, as I conceive it, is a guide post to show the way to casual readers and overworked critics and reviewers. In all probability I shall disappoint two classes of my readers, if there be such. The one, those who contend for the purely "supernatural" element in the Sacraments, because I try to justify them on indubitable natural grounds; the other, those who believe that religious rites savor of the magic and "miraculous" and must therefore be discarded, because I seek to prove that if they be discarded, with them we will discard the reality of religion.

Dr. Robert Park, in a trenchant criticism of my manuscript, wrote me:

"It is at this point (Chapter ix, "The Pagan Mysteries"), it seems to me, that the paper surrenders the psychological point of view. From here on the story is mainly historical and exegetical."

This is largely true, but the treatment seemed to me unavoidable. It would have been possible, as Dr. Park suggested to me, to continue the analysis of cult and ritual, through both the Pagan and Christian Mysteries, on the basis of suggestion and imitation, insisting that the "impulse" or "disposition" to develop a ritual for the outward *expression* of religion was there, and that whatever of intermingling or borrowing there may have been in the use or creation of rites, was the inevitable result of social contacts, but I felt that in the subsequent study of the *historical* evidence of what actually did happen, this psychological viewpoint might be taken for granted.

I have tried to show that it was because both the Pagan and Christian Mysteries took shape under the social influ-

ences of the same Greco-Roman world that they have the same character, but that it was their *external* character only which was influenced by this habitat, both their existence and their persistence, being due to a practical need of our common human nature. It has been said that "formerly we used to disparage religion if science was able to account for it (while) nowadays we disparage religion because science is unable to account for it." It should be remembered that science can only describe phenomena and the processes by which things seem to arise and events occur. Science can not touch the question of ultimate value, except in so far as it may tend to prove that fitness is probably one of the ultimate reasons for survival. Our judgment of value does not rest wholly on practical grounds, however. It is usually associated with an emotional reaction, which *always* signals value, and which is itself the product of some past experience. This emotional reaction is a wonderful and a very *real* thing. I have sought to trace a part of its history, as associated with religious rites, but this is not to *explain* it. Whatever it be and whithersoever it may have come we must admit that it is *real*. Beyond this I do not attempt to go, but those who wish may carry on the argument from the realm of experience—the realm of scientific investigation—into the metaphysical field, and find in it, perchance, the eternal quality of reality and truth.

All of the bibliographical data and most of the discussion of the more technical matters have been confined to the notes, which will be of little interest to the casual reader. But I may be pardoned, I trust, if I call attention to the fact that wherever I have ventured to offer an original contribution relevant to the main thesis, this also has been put in the notes. On two or three moot questions, only indirectly related to the main discussion, I have a tentative suggestion to offer, as on the origin of the later signification of Mithra (p. 132), the interpretation of the Decrees of the Apostolic

Council in the fifteenth chapter of the Books of Acts, (p. 150) and the origin of the number seven as a "sacred number" applied to the Sacraments of the Catholic Church. (p. 179.)

I wish to express formally my indebtedness to Dean Matthews of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, who suggested the particular study of the influence of Dionysius the Areopagite and to Prof. Park of the Department of Sociology, under whose personal advice and criticism the material was prepared.

A. W. C.

Boston, Mass.
August, 1924.

CONTENTS

SACRAMENTS AND SOCIETY

I

THE PRIORITY OF RITES IN RELIGION

WHEREVER religion in any form exists, it finds its outward expression in some form of sacred rites; in fact the outward and visible element of religion is necessarily almost wholly a matter of rites. The African Bushman, who is about the lowest in the scale of social development of any of the living remnants of early primitivity, dances out his religion under the tropical moon while the higher civilizations of Greece and Egypt expressed their religious emotion in the complicated ritual of the Mysteries of Demeter and Isis. Whether it be the Alaskan Eskimo or the Mongol of Tibet, the Druids in Roman England or the Mussulman in British Egypt, everywhere and always the sacred rite is the most prominent part of religious worship.

This can not be the result of mere coincidence; there must be some significance, some meaning to these rites, and it seems quite reasonable to suppose that were it not for the fact that they supplied some real need, we should not find them universally present. Yes, there must be some meaning in these rites and it is in the hope that we may discover something of what religious rites signify, and may understand, to some extent at least, the real service they perform, that this study has been undertaken. We shall find that whatever meaning there is lies hidden in the rite itself. In its earliest and purest form the religious rite is almost void of any "doctrinal" content, its meaning being such that it

can be *felt,* rather than expressed, and while the participants must have *thought* about the significance of the rites they were performing, it did not find any such statement in verbal form as would resemble our "creeds" at all, and one had to be *part* of the proceeding to appreciate it.[1]

One of the most difficult problems that confronts the observer of the customs of primitive peoples is this difficulty in discovering the meaning of their rites, and often we are surprised to find the most conflicting testimony on the part of actual observers, on this subject.

We have become so accustomed to the idea that religion requires a rigid system of doctrine that it is difficult for us to conceive of anything worthy of the name religion, which could be without such a "theology" or body of doctrines. And yet in the most primitive forms of religion this is exactly what we find; *formal* doctrine or statement of belief is almost entirely lacking.

Professor W. Robertson Smith, whose opposition to the then current belief of the Free Church of Scotland cost him his chair at Aberdeen, insisted on this absence of creed in the earliest forms of religion, and pointed out the priority of rite over doctrine. This was over twenty-five years ago,[2] but we have been very slow in appreciating the significance of this striking fact which he was the first to point out. During the interim, however, a great mass of evidence has been accumulating, and students of anthropology and of the

---

[1] The difference in attitude between one who is "on the inside" and one who is not, is strikingly illustrated in one of Prof. James' *Talks to Teachers,* (N. Y. 1913), "On a certain Blindness in Human Beings."

[2] *Religion of the Semites,* (Lond., new ed. 1894), pp. 16-18, *et pass.* "As a rule we find that while the practice was rigorously fixed, the meaning attached to it was extremely vague, and the same rite was explained by different people in different ways, without any question of orthodoxy or heterodoxy arising in consequence." *(ut supra.)*

history of religion are now corroborating the opinion of Prof. Smith, and pointing to the evidence to show that if evolution means the survival of the forms which are most adapted to cope with the problem of existence, and of those elements which supply the needed equipment in this struggle, then surely rites must be of the essence of religion.

What, then, is the general character of a religious rite? Let us answer the question by an inspection of some representative examples, chosen almost at random out of the enormous fund available. [3]

"The religious ritual of the Cora Indians of Mexico comprises elaborate dramatic ceremonies or dances, in which the actors or dancers identify themselves with the gods, such as the god of the Morning Star, the goddess of the Moon, and the divinities of the Rain.[4] These dances form the principal part of the Cora festivals and are accompanied by liturgical songs, the words of which the Indians believe to have been revealed to their forefathers by the gods and to exercise a direct magical influence upon the deities themselves and through them upon nature."[5]

In North-Western Brazil there are two tribes of Indians who celebrate a festival in honor of their dead, in which the masked dancers imitate the actions and habits of certain beasts, birds and insects. The play of butterflies in the sunshine, the swarming of sand flies in the air, the swift darting to and fro of the swallows, these and others are imperson-

---

[3] I have used Dr. Frazer's monumental work, *The Golden Bough*, (London, 3d. ed., 1911-15) 12 vols., in the way that I imagine it was intended to be used, as a storehouse of information, and have drawn my illustrations largely from that source. Referred to as *G. B.*

[4] *cf. infra.* pp. 58 and 71.

[5] Frazer, *Golden Bough*, IX. 381; *apud* K. Th. Preuss, *Die Navarit Expedition*, I. Die Religion der Cora Indianen (Leipsic, 1912), pp. XCII ff.

ated by the dancers, but these representations are no mere pastime, or diversion for the mourners, for "under the outer husk of beasts and birds and insects he believes that there lurk foul fiends and powerful spirits." This mimicry is intended to bring blessings to the village and fertility to their plantations, and "the mysterious force which resides in the mask passes into the dancer, turns the man himself into a mighty demon, and endows him with the power of banning demons or earning their favor. Especially is it the intention by means of the mimicry to obtain for man control over demons of growth and the spirits of game and fish."[6]

Still another example comes from the head-hunting Sea Dyaks of Borneo. After the taking of a human head, a feast is held in honor of their war-god or bird-chief, who lives far away above the skies. One of the actors impersonates this deity, "Singalang Burong" who is believed to be present in the person of the performer. A long liturgy called *Mengap* is chanted, by means of which the god is invoked, but this invocation is not in the form of a direct address or prayer, but in the form of a myth, setting forth how the mythical hero Kling once made a head feast and summoned Singalang Burong to it. "The Dyak performer or performers then, as they walk up and down the long verandah of the house singing the *mangap,* in reality describe Kling's *Cawè Pala* (head-feast), and how Singalang Burong was invited and came. In thought the Dyaks identify themselves with Kling, and the resultant signification is that the recitation of this story is an invocation to Singalang Burong, who is supposed to come not to Kling's house only, but to the actual Dyak house where the feast is celebrated; and he is received by a particular ceremony, and is offered food or sacrifice."[7]

---

[6] Frazer, *Golden Bough,* IX. 381; *apud* Th. Koch-Grünberg, *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern,* (Berlin, 1909-1910) i. 130ff; ii. 169ff.

[7] Frazer, *op. cit.,* IX. 383, 384 n. 1; *apud* Rev. J. Perham, "Men-

Whether we should consider such ceremonies as these *religious* or not, need not here detain us, for the point we are insisting on is that the primary and indispensable thing in religion is the rite, and if one should consider that these ceremonies are *not* religious, then it is evident that in these cases at least, rite antedates and precedes religion. If, on the other hand, we admit that here we find evidences of a primitive type of religion, it seems quite certain that they are manifested in the rite itself.

Andrew Lang wrote his *Myth, Ritual and Religion* (2v., 1887) in support of the thesis that "the existence—even among savages—of comparatively pure, if inarticulate, religious beliefs" [8] could be demonstrated, and subsequently defined this "pure" belief as "the germ of a faith in a Maker and Judge of men" from which he believed religion sprang. [9] In the second volume of this work he devotes a whole chapter to the attempt to show that the Australians possess the "germ" of such a belief, in spite of some arguments to the contrary. His emphasis on Australia was "because the vast continent contains the most archaic and backward of existing races." [10] Among his chief witnesses are Howitt and Spencer and Gillen, from whose writings on the subject, in spite of

---

gap, the song of the Dyak Sea Feast," *Jour Straits Settlement Branch, Royal Asiatic Society*, II. 123 ff. (Singapore, Dec. 1878). cf. E. H. Gomes, *Seventeen Years Among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo* (Lond. 1911), pp. 213 ff., who adds the following details: "The singing of this song takes up the whole night. It begins before 8 P. M. and lasts till next morning. * * * On the third day of the festival a pig is sacrificed, and the people shout together at short intervals until a hawk is seen flying in the heavens. The hawk is Singalang Burong, who has taken that form to manifest himself to them. He has accepted their offerings and has heard their cry."

[8] *op. cit.*, I. xl. (New ed., 1899).

[9] Lang, *Making of Religion*. (London, 1898, 2nd 1900).

[10] II. 33.

the fact that they are so familiar, but because of the very backwardness of these particular peoples, we may find still further evidence, tacitly admitted by Lang, that even where the presence of "pure" religion may be in doubt, there rite exercises undisputed domain. Howitt [11] gives a detailed description of the initiation of several Katungal [12] boys. The account is too long to quote in full, but as it detracts from its effect to attempt to abridge it, the best we can do will be to select a few significant passages from the picturesque narrative.

"As soon as we had reached the camp and the men were distributed through it, the distant roaring sound of the *Mudthis* [13] was heard and the whole camp was instantly in commotion. The women started up, and seizing their rugs and blankets, hastily went with their children to a vacant space on the north side of the encampment, where they recommenced the "tooth"-song. Meanwhile the men were stalking about among the camps shouting *"Ha! Wah!"* commanding silence among the women. In a very short time these with their children were huddled together in a close group, surrounded by the men, who were stamping a dance to the

---

[11] *Native Tribes of South-East Australia.* (London 1904), pp. 529 ff.

[12] "Fishermen"; Katung=the sea. A branch of the Coast Murring or Yuin tribe, along the coast of New South Wales, from Cape Howe nearly to Sidney.

[13] i. e. "bull-roarer." "The merest amateur who cuts a thin slab of wood to the shape of a laurel leaf, and ties to one end a good thick piece of string three or four feet long, has only to whirl the instrument on his forefinger and he will at once get a taste of its windy note." (Marett, *Threshhold of Religion*, (Lond. 1909), p. 155). Full bibliography on its use in Fraser, *G. B.*, 3d ed. XI. 228, n2. *cf.* also Lang, *Myth, Ritual and Religion*, I. 273; Harrison, J. E., *Themis*, (Camb. 1912), p. 61f., where (n. 3) the identfication of Κῶνος in the Greek Mysteries with this instrument is discussed.

word *"Wah!"* finally closing in round them, and silently raising their hands to the sky. This silent gesture again means *"Daramulun,* whose name cannot be lawfully spoken there. * * * The women and children were now pushed together into as small a compass as possible, * * *. Skin rugs and blankets were then placed over them, so that they were completely hidden, * * * and as I left I could hear the muffled sound of the "tooth"-song being sung by the women under their coverings.

* * * * *

"The intention of all that is done at this ceremony is to make a momentous change in the boy's life; the past is to be cut off from him by a gulf which he can never repass. His connection with his mother as her child is broken off, and he becomes henceforth attached to the men. * * * To do all this is partly the object of the ceremonies, and the process by which it is reached is a singular one. The ceremonies are intended to impress and terrify the boy in such a manner that the lesson may be indelible, and may govern the whole of his future life. But the intention is also to amuse in the intervals of the serious rites.

"The ceremonies, therefore, are marked by what may be called major and minor stages, and the intervals are filled in by magic dances, by amusing interludes and buffoonery, in which all the men take part, excepting the *Kabos,* whose duty is to unceasingly explain and admonish during the whole ceremony; to point the moral and adorn the tale. * * *

"On the summit of the hill there was another halt, and here was the first magic dance. The boys and their *Kabos* stood in a row and the men danced in a circle before them, shouting the name for "legs." * * * One of the *Gommeras* darted into this enclosed space, and danced the magic dance. This is done as if sitting almost on the heels but the knees are widely apart, and the two hands are extended downwards until the fingers almost touch the ground. The medicine-

man then hops backwards and forwards with a staring expression of face, his head vibrates from side to side, and he suddenly shows, sometimes after apparently internal struggles, one of his Joïas [14] between his teeth. This is supposed to have been brought from within himself. The other men are meantime dancing round him, and I have occasionally seen him work himself into a kind of ecstatic frenzy, and fall down, once almost into the fire, utterly exhausted. While this was going on, the *Kabos* spoke in earnest tones to their boys, explaining to them the great and deadly powers of the *Gommeras,* and the necessity of their obeying every instruction given to them.

"After a further ascent of a steep mountain ridge, there was another halt before crossing the summit of the range * * *. After circling round the boys twice, the procession resolved itself into a ring in front of the boys and the men danced the usual magic dance * * * (and) then, ceasing to dance, rushed to the boys in an excited manner, old Yibaimalian leading the way, and for the first time went through one of their most characteristic performances. They all shouted *"Ngai!"* meaning "Good" and at the same time moved their arms and hands as if passing something from themselves to the boys, who, being instructed by the *Kabos,* moved their hands and arms as if pulling a rope toward themselves, the palms of the hands being held upwards. The intention of this is that the boys shall be completely filled—saturated, I might say—with the magic proceeding from the initiated and the medicine-men, so that *Daramulun* will like them." * * *

"The old men being ready, we went down a cattle track to the lower glen where a place was chosen and a space cleared for the tooth ceremony. * * * A great stringy-bark tree was close to the northern side, and on this the Bega *Gommera* cut

[14] Pieces of quartz crystal, used by the medicine-men, and believed to be projected into people. *cf. op. cit.,* p. 357-58.

in relief the figure of a man of life-size in the attitude of dancing. This represented *Daramulun,* whose ceremonies they are, and who, as is taught to the novices, is cognizant of the *Kuringal* proceedings.

* * * * *

"At this time the scene was striking. Some of the men were standing at the east side of the cleared space, some on the west side, the boys and their *Kabos* being on the north, almost at the foot of the tree on which the figure, about three feet in length, of *Daramulun* was cut. In front of them were (the) motionless disguised figures. The *Gommera* Brupin was at a little distance almost hidden in some scrub, and old Gunjerung, the head *Gommera,* stood apart from all as was his custom, leaning on his staff, waiting for the moment when all being ready, he would give the signal for the ceremony to commence.

* * * * *

"Gunjerung now signed with his staff, and the masked figures, springing up, rushed to the novices, and commenced to dance to the words *"Wirri-wirri-wirri,"* that is "Quick, quick, quick." As they did this, one of the *Kabos* knelt behind his boy, with his right knee on the ground, and the boy sat on his left as a seat. The other *Kabo* came behind and drew the boy's head on to his breast, having his left arm around his chest, and his right hand over the boy's eyes. The *Kabo* kneeling on the ground held the boy's legs, his feet being in the holes.

"From behind the bushes where he had been concealed, the *Gommera* Brupin now suddenly emerged dancing, bearing in one hand a short wooden club and in the other a piece of wood about eight inches long and chisel-shaped at the end. Being the representative of *Daramulun,* he was clothed only in a complete suit of charcoal dust.[15]

[15] On the significance of this smearing of the body in initiatory rites *vide* Harrison, *Themis,* p. 17 ff. For the older view that it

"The boy's eyes being covered, he danced into the space between them and the masked men to excited shouts of *"Wirri,"* to which the other men were also dancing, and thus approached the first boy. He now handed his implements to the man nearest him, and seizing the boy's head with his hands, applied his lower incisor to the left upper incisor of the boy, and forcibly pressed it upwards. He then, dancing all the time, placed the chisel on the tooth and struck a blow on the mallet. This time the tooth was loosened and I could see the blood. Some of the dancing men now came between the boy and me, so that I lost count of the blows for a few seconds. However, I counted seven and I think that there was at least one more. The tooth then fell out of its socket, and Brupin gave it to one of the old men.[16] The boy was then led aside by the *Kabo,* who told him that he must on no account spit out the blood, but swallow it, otherwise the wound would not heal. The stoical indifference shown by this boy, to what must have been an exquisitely painful operation, was most surprising. I watched him carefully, and he could not have shown less feeling had he been a block of wood. But as he was led away I noticed that the muscles of his legs quivered in an extraordinary manner.

* * * * *

"Twice when the proceedings flagged a little, Yibai-malian made me a sign for *Mudthi,* namely moving the forefinger of the right hand in a small circle, and I sent my messenger to the mound of rocks to sound the bull-roarer out of sight. Directly the sound was heard the whole camp, excepting the

was related to a symbolic cleansing *vide* Andrew Lang, *op. cit.*, I. 274 ff.

[16] Frazer suggests that this rite may be intended to procure immortality, "the tooth regarded as a vital part of the man which was sacrificed to ensure another life for him after death." (*G. B.*, I. 97).

Kabos and novices, was in a state of excitement, the men shouting *"Huh! huh!"* and the dancing went on with renewed vigour.

"The novices were thus kept in a constant state of excitement and suspense until, as I have said, at about three in the morning, when the old men danced to the word *Kair,* that is "the end, the finish." The magic fire was let burn low, the boys were laid on their couch of leaves, and all hands rolled themselves into their rugs or blankets and slept."

The one outstanding impression that this account must leave with the reader is, it seems to me, that here we have a multitude of rites,—but can we say nothing but rites? Before the boys were led back to the camp, we are told, in a section which I have not reproduced, that the *Kabos* solemnly informed them that *Daramulun* "lived beyond the sky and watched what the Murring did. When a man died he met him and took care of him. It was he who first made the *Kuringal* [17] and taught it to their fathers, and he taught them also to make weapons, and all that they know. The *Gommeras* receive their powers from him, and he gives them *Krugullung.*[18] He is the great Biamban [19] who can do anything and go anywhere, and he gave the tribal laws to their fathers, who have handed them down from father to son until now." Evidently these rites are not devoid of meaning, but the very fact that this verbal instruction is reserved till the very last, suggests that the rites have already inculcated it and are the more necessary element of the whole, if it is possible, in fact to separate them at all. But what I wish to insist upon is that the rite itself has produced a very definite effect. It makes a *man* out of a boy, and what was even more evident, from the lively narrative, it made a mere

[17] *i. e.* this ceremony of initiation.

[18] Another name for the magic quartz crystal.

[19] Great Master.

boy submit to the knocking out of one of his front teeth in a most brutal way, with no more emotion than if he had "been a block of wood."

Among the Arunta and Ilpirra tribes of central Australia, the initiation ceremonies are very elaborate, and extend over a period of some fifteen years, from the time when a boy is about ten years of age till he reaches an age of perhaps twenty-five. The last of these rites, the *Engwura,* which is a sort of fire ordeal, makes the novice a full member of the tribe. We can not here describe this rite in detail, but it is of interest to note what Spencer and Gillen say of its significance.[20]

"It is in this way that the boy during the initiation ceremonies is instructed, for the first time in any of the sacred matters referring to the totems, and it is by means of the performances which are concerned with certain animals, or rather, *apparently* with the animals, but in reality with Alcheringa [21] individuals who were the direct transformations of such animals, that the traditions dealing with this subject, which is of the greatest importance in the eyes of the natives, are firmly impressed upon the mind of the novice, to whom everything which he sees and hears is new and surrounded with an air of mystery. * * * The natives themselves say that the ceremony has the effect of strengthening all who pass through it. It imparts courage and wisdom, makes the men more kindly natured and less apt to quarrel; in short, it makes them *ertwa murra oknirra,* words which respectively mean "man, good, great or very," the word good being, of course, used with the meaning attached to it by the native. Evidently the main objects of it are, firstly, to bring the young men under the control of the old men, whose commands they have to obey implicitly; secondly, to teach them habits of self-

[20] *Native Tribes of Central Australia,* (Lond., 1899), p. 229-230; 271-272.

[21] *i. e.* the remote past.

restraint and hardihood; and thirdly, to show to the younger men who have arrived at mature age, the sacred secrets of the tribe which are concerned with the Churinga [22] and the totems with which they are associated.

* * * * *

"It must be remembered that it is now for the first time that the *Wurtja* [23] hears anything of these traditions and sees the ceremonies performed, in which the ancestors of the tribe are represented as they were, and acting as they did during life. In various accounts of initiation ceremonies of the Australian tribes, as, for example, in the earliest one ever published—the one written by Collins in 1804—we meet with descriptions of performances in which different animals are represented, but except in the case of the Arunta tribe, no indication of the meaning and signification of these ceremonies has been forthcoming beyond the fact that they are associated with the totems. In the Arunta and Ilpirra tribes they are not only intimately associated with the totemic system, but have a very definite meaning. Whether they have a similar significance in the other tribes we have as yet no definite evidence to show, but it is at all events worthy of note that while the actual initiation rites vary from tribe to tribe, consisting in some of the knocking out of the teeth, and in others of circumcision, etc. in all, or nearly all, an important part of the ceremony consists in showing to the novices certain dances, the important and common feature of which is that they represent the actions of special totemic animals. In the Arunta tribe, however, they have a very definite meaning. At the first glance it looks much as if all that they were intended to represent were the behavior of

---

[22] Something sacred or secret. "Most frequently used to mean one of the sacred stones or sticks of the Arunta, which are the equivalents of the bull-roarers of the other tribes."

[23] The name for a novice in the circumcision rite, after he has been painted but before the actual operation.

certain animals, but in reality they have a much deeper meaning, for each performer represents an ancestral individual who lived in the Alcheringa. He was a member of a group of individuals, all of whom just like himself, were the direct descendants or transformations of the animals, the names of which they bore. It is as a reincarnation of the never-dying spirit part of one of these semi-animal ancestors that every member of the tribe is born, and, therefore, when born he, or she, bears of necessity the name of the animal or plant of which the Alcheringa ancestor was a transformation or descendant."[24]

Perhaps enough has been said by way of illustration of the priority of rites in matters of religion, but it might be objected that all the illustrations here given have been chosen from barbarous and uncultured peoples; so let us turn to Rome at the height of its glory and see what we find there.

In his description of the religious festivals at Rome during the Republic, Fowler [25] summarizes several authorities on the subject as follows: "In all these works the one point insisted on at the outset is this: that the Romans were more interested in the cult of their deities, that is in the ritual and routine by which they could be rightly and successfully propitiated, than in the character and personality of the deities themselves." The Roman religion consisted almost wholly of ceremonial observances, processions, and festivals, libations and sacrifices, all of them elaborate and impressive, the details of which were strictly prescribed and scrupulously observed. Cicero [26] himself points to the important thing in religion, as he knew it, when he says :"If we wish to compare ourselves

---

[24] *op. cit.*, p. 227-228.

[25] Fowler, W. Warde, *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic.* (London, 1899), p. 333.

[26] *De Natura Deorum* (II. 3, 8) Si conferre columus nostra cum externis, ceteris rebus aut pares aut inferiores reperiemur, religione, id est cultu deorum, multo superiores.

with foreigners, though in certain things we will be found only their equals or even their inferiors, in religion, that is in the cult of the gods, we are much superior to them." As he has said just previously that it was through the observance of the "requirements of religion" that the state had become great it is quite evident that he found the superiority of the Romans in their sacred *rites*.

Among these rites, none were more characteristic, probably, than those connected with the worship of Vesta. One of these, the *Vestalia,* may be described briefly as follows.[27] On the seventh of June the sacred storehouse of the Temple of Vesta (*penus*[28] *Vestae*) was thrown open to the public, who, for seven days thronged it barefoot.[29] The significance of this is not evident unless we remember that at all other times these sacred precincts were forbidden to all men but the Pontifex Maximus. The days of the festival were holidays, on which no public business could be performed, but more than this they were solemn or sacred days on which the priestess of Vesta was forbidden to cut her nails or perform other specified duties. During these holy days the Vestal Virgins crushed the first fruits of corn, which had been gathered about a month earlier, and from the flour thus made, prepared sacred cakes which were solemnly offered on plain earthenware dishes of an ancient pattern.[30] No doubt because of this ancient rite the millers and bakers decorated their shops, and all mules, as well, were garlanded and bedecked with cakes.[31] At the end of eight days, that is

---

[27] Fowler, *op. cit.*, pp. 148 ff.

[28] *Penus*, originally food, then "store-house" (*cf.* Cicero, *op. cit.*, II.68) the sacred center of the temple of Vesta. On the *Penates vide Themis*, pp. 300 ff.

[29] *cf.* Ovid, *Fasti* 6, 395 ff. for a description of his own experience.

[30] Varro, *De Lingua Latina*, VI. 32.

[31] Mules were used to turn the grinding mills.

on the 15th of June, the room of the temple (*aedas*) was carefully swept by the Vestals and with the last act of this formal cleansing, the restrictions of the festival came to an end. [32]

This is, in brief, all that there was to the festival of the *Vestalia,* so prominent in that religious observance which Cicero thought had led to the glory of Rome! It is worthy of note that the duties here performed by the Vestal Virgins appear to have no *immediate* connection with the fire which it was their sacred duty to guard, and yet there must have been some remote connection between these ceremonies and that primary duty. Dr. Frazer was the first to suggest [33] that the origin of the Vestal Virgins was probably to be found in the tending of the domestic hearth by the King's daughters, and the ceremonies just mentioned would seem to have been perpetuated from the time when the duties of these maidens included the *rest* of the household duties as well. Cleaning the house, preparing the food and tending the sacred fire of the hearth seem to have come down from a forgotten past together, and in the *Vestalia* these elements of the ancient household routine had come to constitute the whole of the sacred rite. [34] As with this portion, so with

---

[32] Dionysius of Halicarnasus, writing in the time of Augustus, remarked on the *simplicity* of these rites, and expressed his admiration for "a people which thus walked in the ways of their fathers, not deviating from the ancient rites into extravagance and display." (*Antic. Rom.*, II. 23) *vide* Frazer, *G. B.*, II. 203 n. 1.

[33] *Journal of Philology, XIV.* (1885) No. 28, pp. 145 ff.

[34] The duties of the Vestals are given by Servius, *Ad Virg. Eccl.*, viii. 82. Their association with harvest and fertility festivals deceived even Varro, *cf.* St. Augustine, *De Civitatis Dei*, vii. 24, and suggested that identification of Vesta with the Earth.

The "new fire" was obtained on March 1st; (Festus 106) cf. Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 147, n. 5. The *flamines* or "kindlers" were originally associated with this rite. Frazer suggests that they may have been originally the King's sons, (*G. B.*, II. 199).

For similar rites of cleansing storehouses etc., especially that of the Creek Indians, *cf.* Frazer, *G. B.*, II. 72 ff.

the rest of the religion of the Romans, it was primarily, at least, if not well nigh wholly, a matter of rites. There do not seem to have been any doctrines attached to these rites, the origin and significance of which appear to have been quite unknown. The priority of rite is, here at least, clearly established. Doctrine may, then, be practically lacking in religion, but it nowhere exists without some form of rite. We have found evidence, however, of an inchoate "tradition" or myth associated with the rites in some of the examples which we have examined, and this raises the question of the relation between myths and rites, which we must now consider.

II

THE NATURE OF MYTH

SINCE most of us begin our education with Mother Goose and Grimm, or some other fairy tales, and get our first taste of literature from Aesop or the legends of early Greek heroes, we are likely to have a double misconception of mythology. In the first place we most of us think of a myth as being a mere invention, a figment of the imagination, and furthermore we conceive of its purpose as being the teaching of some lesson; in a word we make it purely intellectual. We are prone to consider myth as something that never happened, but is, nevertheless, essentially rational, when in reality a *genuine* myth never did anything but happen and is fundamentally irrational!

The natural birth of a real myth can be seen almost any day in any house in the land that is gladdened by the playful prattle of children. What mother but has had to reason with herself to keep from flying to pieces at the ceaseless flow of running comment which drowned out everything else: "Mother, I'm making a cake, mother, *mother!* MOTHER!! I'm making a cake, I'm making a cake. And now in goes the sugar, I'm putting in the sugar, Mother, the sugar."[1] It seems a far cry from this to an Australian jungle, but here is what Spencer and Gillen record of the making of a *Nurtunja,* a sort of human effigy, in a totem ceremony of the Alice Springs natives:[2] "Four of the Purula men then began

[1] Of course there is no sugar, probably nothing but a stick to serve as a stirring spoon; the whole process is pure make-believe, and the running comment explains it.

[2] *Native Tribes of Central Australia,* p. 284.

to decorate the pole with alternate rings of red and white down. Each of them took a short twig, bound a little fur string around one end, dipped the brush thus made into the blood, and then smeared this over the place where the down was to be fixed on. The blood on congealing formed an excellent adhesive material. All the time this was taking place, the men sang a monotonous chant, the words of which were merely a constant repetition of some such simple refrain as, 'Paint it around with rings and rings,' 'the *Nurtunja* of the Alcheringa,' 'paint the Nurtunja with rings.' Every now and again they burst out into loud singing, starting on a high note and gradually descending, the singing dying away as the notes got lower and lower, producing the effect of music dying away in the distance."

Probably there are other subjects which have caused as much discussion and about which there have been as many conflicting theories, but it would be hard to imagine one that could produce *more* varieties of speculation than has this very problem of determining the origin and purpose of myth. [3]

[3] On this subject the books are many. The more modern view is displacing such opinions as those of Lang (*Myth, Ritual and Religion*) though he admits that the mysteries are dramatizations of myth (I.19); Fiske, J. (*Myths and Myth Makers*) *et. al.* "The former systems of exegesis, from Euhemerus and the Stoics to Creuzer and Max Müller, have this feature in common; they consider myths and religions as the product of a special faculty of man, set in motion by an impression from without, and historical recollection, or an abstract idea—or it may be led astray by some verbal will-o'-the-wisp. The great superiority in the new system lies in the fact that it emphasizes the stringent ties which connect the evolution of cults and myths with the sum total of human faculties, and the progress of civilization both moral and material." (Reinach, *Cults, Myths and Religions*, (Lond., 1912, p. xiii.) *vide etiam* Brinton, *Religious Sentiment*, (N. Y., 1876), p. 156; Frazer, *G. B.*, IX p. 385 ff., where a possible basis for the "reconciliation" of two schools of interpretation is suggested.

Andrew Lang was probably right when he insisted that in all mythology—and in religion where myths "intrude"—there are two elements, one rational, the other irrational, but recent investigators have tended toward a reversal of his conclusion that religion found its earliest expression in what, to him, appeared to be the perfectly "rational and transparent" belief in a Supreme Being.[4] It is coming to be more and more generally understood that myth was not originally legend, in the strict sense of the word, at all, but audible rite, if such a term is permissible.

It is important to an appreciation of this fact that we should make a clear distinction between the "mythical" or legendary and the religious or cult myth. The former of these is more properly called "folk-lore" while the latter, which is the true myth, may be called "cult-lore."[5] The myth is so intimately bound up with the rite that they may be considered practically simultaneous in origin, and to be separated only in theoretical abstraction. Of their probable origin I shall speak later, but here we are concerned only with this closeness of relationship between them. Subsequently the myth may come to be detached from the rite, for various reasons, and gradually transformed till it is almost past recognition. While originally a myth, it now comes to be incorporated in the body of folk-lore. So long as it continues to be a myth, it retains its primitive odor of sanctity

[4] The most recent students of the subject seem to prefer, on the whole, the view that there was a "pre-animistic" era, in which the conception of mysterious powers was not yet strictly personal. Of this "Dynamistic" school are the writers whose views we have here followed. van Gennep, in *Rites de Passage*, (Paris 1909), pp. 8 ff. gives a summary of recent and earlier writers on both sides of the discussion.

[5] *cf.* Ames, E. S., *The Psychology of Religious Experience*, (Boston, 1910), p. 150; *Themis*, pp. 330-331; Newell, W. W., "*Ritual regarded as the Dramatization of Myth*" in *Memoirs of International Congress of Anthropology*, (Chicago, 1894), 237 ff.

and is guarded from profanation with great care, but once separated from the rite it may be bandied about from mouth to mouth without let or hindrance. "An Algonkin," says William Jones,[6] "holds that the proper time to recite a myth is in winter, and that its recitation shall be attended with some kind of formality; and that to tell a myth out of season and without formality is to take chances with something beyond human power." What I would call attention to just here is that the myth is not the recounting of something to be believed, but is the verbal description, in word-symbols, of the acts performed in the rite.[7]

We have already mentioned some illustrations of this connection of the myth with the rite, as a sort of running comment, when discussing the rites, but we may notice some other instances, in order to direct attention to this primary character of the myth.

In the Grizzly Bear dance of the Indians, a chant describing the restlessness of the bear in early spring when he prepares to emerge from his den, accompanies the pantomime of the dancers:

> I begin to grow restless in the spring.
> I take my robe,
> My robe is sacred,
> I wander in the summer.[8]

---

[6] "The Algonkin Manitou," in *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, XVIII. (1905) p. 189. Cushing says that among the Zuni, though a myth was told only at night during the *winter*, it could be told during the *day* at other seasons of the year. (*Bureau of American Ethnology, Report:* XI. (1889-1890), p. 369).

[7] "As man is a speaking as well as a motor animal, any complete human ceremony usually contains both elements, speech and action, or as the Greeks would put it, we have in a rite τὰ δρώμενα and also τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς δρωμένοις λεγόμενα" (Harrison, *Themis*, p. 329).

[8] *ut supra* from W. McClintock, *The Old North Trail*, (Lond., 1910), p. 264 ff.

During certain ceremonies connected with the propitiation of the *Wollunqua,* a gigantic snake which the Warramunga tribe of northern Australia revere as a totem animal, the natives build a large sandy mound, which is associated with one of the myths of Wollunqua, or rather the myth is associated with the building of the mound, during which it is chanted. It recounts the deeds of the giant snake, and its refrains are couched in words which have come to be *meaningless to the hearers,* but are said to be the language of the ancient and legendary past. [9]

This use of words which have lost their meaning is, it seems to me, probably the first step in the separation of the myth from the rite, or perhaps it would be better to say the first stage in the *evolution* of a legend. While they were used with the rite, the action continued to supply their meaning, which must otherwise have been wholly unintelligible. Sooner or later, however, the way would be open for the substitution of a new myth, because of the need of an explanation for the rite itself which, like the ancient words, would have ceased to be understood.

---

cf. Dorsey, G. A., *The Pawnee,* (Washington, 1906), pp. 350-351, where a similar song, though for a different ceremony is found: "The Bears had told her to sing the song, and promised that if they heard it and decided to help her, she would find on the next morning cedar limbs around her tipi. The song she sang was this:

Some one spoke and told me.
Yonder shall come, etc.
That my father stood where I now stand.
Yonder shall come, yonder shall come.
* * * *
I am now imitating the Bear.
I am now acting like one.
Yonder shall come, etc.

[9] Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Australia,* (London 1904) pp. 234-235.

Among the Omaha there is another striking example of this early identity between the rite and its verbal symbol, which is even more peculiar. Many of the songs of the Omaha can not be said to have *words* at all, that is, words which carry any clear meaning, for we are told that in them the voice was "carried by vacables only." [10] But in spite of this, the song was able to "convey a well understood meaning." We are not told *how* this could be, but the association of the songs with mimetic acts in the rites makes it perfectly possible. In fact the practice of the Australian tribe and that of the American Indian tribe appear, in this respect, to be strictly analogous.

The whole subject of the development of myth, and its subsequent separation from rite, in the form of legend, finally developing into literature and drama [11] is too complicated for us to enter into here, and to do so would not further our purpose, which is to point out that at first it had nothing of the character of formal doctrine. We can only suggest the probable course of its separation from the rite of which it was at first an integral part, and the beginning of the element of teaching which later became associated with it.

In summarizing the most important points contained in his exhaustive study of the myths of the Cheyenne Indians [12]

---

[10] Fletcher, Alice C., "The Omaha Tribe," *Bureau of American Ethnology, Report,* XXVII. (1905-1906), p. 373. A phonograph record of the singing of a certain song by an old man was compared after some years with a repetition of the same song, without discovering any variation. The native was about seventy, and must have sung this without change for about fifty years. On being asked how this could be, he replied: "There is but one way to sing a song."

[11] *vide* Miss Harrison's *Themis,* pp. 333 n. 1, 339, 341, ff.; Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States,* 5v., (Oxford 1896-1909), V. 230ff.; Powell, J. W., *Bureau of Amer. Ethnol. Reports,* XIX. (1897-98), Introduction, p. lxxix.

[12] Dorsey, G. A., *The Cheyenne,* (Chicago, 1905), p. 50.

Dorsey considers first the probable origin of their rites, as revealed in these myths,[13] with this conclusion: "Thus it appears that the tales collectively furnish us an account of two culture heroes, or one culture hero with two names, who left the camp, visited a mountain, witnessed a ceremony, obtained a bundle, returned to the camp and performed a ceremony as it had been witnessed, with the result that the tribe was rescued from famine at that particular time and was furnished means for warding off the famine and their enemies in the future. There is no word of explanation as to why the ceremony was given or how it was originated in the true sense of the word. 'Standing-Medicine' and 'Erect-Horns' simply bring to the people a special medicine, in the form of a ceremony which they had witnessed and in which they had been instructed by supernatural beings." We are here at the stage when the myth is still closely related to the rite, and although beginning to be separated from the *performance* of the rite, and to take on the legendary form, there is as yet no explanation. The myth has not begun to be *aetiological.* The only known origin and the only significance of these myths is still found in the rites, the "medicine" which they describe.

Boas,[14] whose special field of study has been mythology,

---

[13] Mr. Dorsey uses the word "myth" here in the wider sense of legend. The Rev. J. O. Dorsey, likewise, in his study of the Siouan Cults (*Bureau of American Anthropology, Report* XI., pp. 368-369), says that myth is parallel to legend, both being considered as "lying tales," while both are distinguished from the superhuman recitals which deal with *Wakanda.* This confusion could be avoided if the word *myth* were *reserved* for its original signification of the "recitative" connected with the rites. *Vide Themis,* p. 331, and reference there to the definition by van Gennep, in his paper *Was ist Mythus,* where this proposal was made.

[14] *Journal of American Folk-Lore,* "The Growth of Indian Mythologies," IX. (1896), pp. 1-11.

and in which he is admittedly preeminent, dismisses the idea that the myths arose from an attempted explanation of the phenomena of nature, and insists that we must "give up the attempts at off-hand explanations of myths as fanciful, and we must admit that, also, explanations given by the Indians themselves are often secondary, and do not reflect the true origin of the myths." It is when the meaning of the rite ceases to be *felt* that the myth first tends to take on a more definite form, and one of two things may happen; either the rite may be given a new interpretation, through a change in the myth accompanying it, or the myth may be separated from the rite, with the result that both are now free to take on new forms, each going its independent way, and both, now forced to depend solely on their own vitality, are liable to extinction and oblivion.[15] Perhaps in no two discoverable instances will the course of this separation correspond in all of its stages, but agreement in the beginning and in the final outcome of the change, suggests that there are no important variations in the process.

One "legend" of the Pawnee preserves in itself so much that is suggestive that it is worthy of reproduction in its entirety, particularly since it is both simple and brief, and for this reason may be deemed comparatively pure.

"The Lost Warrior and the Singing Buffalo Medicine"

"There were many warriors who were on the war-path,

[15] Religion points the way to the development of both art and morality. The sense of depletion, of insufficient satisfaction, would seem to be the origin of the one; the feeling of obligation, of the other. Their difference from religion lies, fundamentally in that they both assume *knowledge*, a content of past experience which, in their inception at least, marks them off clearly from religion. A ceremony which originated with religion may thus pass over into either art or morality, or both. *cf. supra* note 11 on Drama, and *infra* p. 63 n. 19 on magic. *cf. etiam infra* p. 107 n. 17.

and as they were going into the Chienne country they were overtaken by the enemy. One man slipped off from his pony and hid in the thick bush. The enemy passed him and went on after the others. The man came out from his hiding-place and went on towards home. He thought that he was lost. He cried and called to all the gods in the heavens and to all the animal gods. Just a little before daylight as he was climbing a hill, he heard some one singing. He went on and when he had climbed the hill he heard the singing coming from the East. He looked and saw a Buffalo cow running towards him and snorting as she came. The man was frightened but the Buffalo said: 'Do not be afraid. I was singing as I loped along over these hills; you heard the song, and I will teach it to you and you will start a dance that will be called the Big-Warrior dance.' The Buffalo and the man sat down together on top of the hill and they looked toward the east.

"As the sun came up the Buffalo galloped off towards the east, singing the same song:

"There coming coming yonder.
There coming, coming yonder.
There coming, coming yonder.
There coming, coming yonder.
There coming, coming yonder.
There coming, coming yonder.
There coming, coming yonder.
The Buffalo is coming, coming yonder.

"The man learned many mysterious things from the Buffalo, and the Buffalo gave him power to travel without growing tired, and to capture many ponies. The man was told to sing the song at dawn as the Buffalo had done. The man returned to his home, and when the dawn came in the east he sang the song about the Buffalo coming with good

message to the man. After that the man when on war-path always had success in capturing ponies." [16]

The first thing that strikes us here is that we have a myth, the real meaning of which has been forgotten. An appended note says that it is intended to teach that one should always listen, when on the road alone, as there might be some kind animal that wanted to tell one some "good message," but there is no suggestion of this even in the present form of the legend. Apparently, also, the ponies are a later addition. Originally the myth must have been connected with some rite known as the Big-Warrior Medicine, the *purpose* of which has been entirely forgotten, since it was not defined in the myth *apart from the rite,* and was lost when the rite disappeared.

I think that I have made it sufficiently clear that in its origin myth had nothing to do with doctrine. It was not intended to teach anything, but, together with the rite, of which it formed an integral—and, except in theory, inseparable—part, was intended to *do* something. Frazer speaks of the combined rite and myth as a sort of mystic drama, of which he says, speaking, to be sure, of a particular myth:

"A myth is never so graphic and precise in its details as when it is, so to speak, the book of the words which are spoken and acted by the performers of the sacred rite." [17] * * * "The intention of these sacred dramas, we may be sure, was neither to amuse nor to instruct an idle audience, and as little were they designed to gratify the actors, to whose baser passions they gave the rein for a time. * * * The dramas are played, the mysteries performed, not to teach the spectators the doctrines of their creed, still less to entertain them, but for the purpose of bringing about those

[16] Dorsey, G. A., *The Pawnee: Mythology* (Pt. 1.), (Wash., D. C., 1906), pp. 337-378.

[17] *Golden Bough,* X. p. 105.

natural effects which they represent in mythical disguise; in a word, they are magical ceremonies and their mode of operation is mimicry or sympathy. We shall probably not err in assuming that many myths, which are known only as myths, had once their counterpart in magic; in other words, that they used to be acted as means of producing in fact the events which they describe in figurative language."[18]

Of course, on Dr. Frazer's theory that magic and religion are fundamentally incompatible,[19] we should have to admit that all such rites as we have been considering were pure magic, and in the sense in which he uses the word, *non*-religious, but without committing ourselves to his theory, we may simply summarize our discussion so far, by agreeing with him that the combination of rite with myth was intended for a *single* purpose, and that they were used simply and solely "as means of producing *in fact* the events which they described" in figurative symbols of act and spoken words. Our chief interest is in trying to discover how the use of such ceremonies could ever have arisen, and what it is that makes them persist, in spite of the progress of civilization and the development of science, even in our own midst.

---

[18] *ibid.* IX., pp. 373-374.

[19] *op. cit.*, I. pp. 224-225.

III

THE GENESIS OF CEREMONIES

THE one thing which is essential to primitive society is ceremonial. The whole life of primitive man is so absolutely dependent upon the use of ceremonial that its inevitable presence has come to be regarded as one of the unmistakable signs of primitivity. As far back as we can go in human history, we find ourselves face to face with well established ceremonies; and in the case of the surviving representatives of savagery and barbarism, to whom we might look, in this twentieth century, for some light on the *origin* of such customs, we find in every instance that they are attributed, by ancient tradition, to a still more ancient past. For the anthropologist, ceremonial is, in the end, a *datum*. Often he can trace it through certain stages of its evolution, transformation or diffusion, but *back of it* he can not go. Human society seems to begin with it, and though civilization may, in a sense, be said to have led to the gradual banishment of ceremonial, one might be justified, in the light of history, in believing that ceremonial will not wholly disappear so long as human society remains.

We are wont to say that uncivilized peoples are ruled by *custom,* and while this is true, it is but a half-truth. It is not in the prevalence of custom as a guide to conduct that the greatest difference is to be found between primitive peoples and ourselves, for what one of us is free from the tyranny of custom? In discussing the "Mind of Primitive Man" Boas says,[1] among other things: "A comparison between the modes of life of different nations, and particularly

[1] *Journal of American Folk-Lore, XIV.* (1901), pp. 1-11. *cf. The Mind of Primitive Man,* (N. Y., 1913), esp. chaps. 4 and 8.

of civilized man and of primitive man, makes it clear that an enormous number of our actions are determined entirely by traditional associations. When we consider, for instance, the whole range of our daily life, we notice how strictly we are dependent upon tradition that can not be accounted for by any logical reasoning. We eat three meals a day, and feel unhappy if we have to forego one of them. There is no physiological reason which demands three meals a day, and we find that many people are satisfied with two meals, while others enjoy four or even more. The range of animals and plants which we utilize for food is limited, and we have a decided aversion against eating dogs, or horses, or cats. There is certainly no objective reason for such aversion, since a great many people consider dogs and horses as dainties. When we consider fashions, the same becomes still more apparent. To appear in the fashions of our forefathers of two centuries ago would be entirely out of the question, and would expose one to ridicule. The same is true of table manners. To smack one's lips is considered decidedly bad style, and may even incite feelings of disgust; while among the Indians, for instance, it would be considered as in exceedingly bad taste not to smack one's lips when one is invited to dinner, because it would suggest that the guest does not enjoy his dinner. The whole range of actions that are considered as proper and improper cannot be explained by any logical reason, but are almost all entirely due to custom; that is to say they are purely traditional."

After all, in some things we are not so different from the savages! We are still the creatures of habit, and if *our* habits are different from those of the savage, it is because of the different stuff out of which they are made. We never stop to think at all about most of the things we do, least of all our social customs. Why is it that a gentleman lifts his hat to a lady whom he knows, while an officer in uniform

does not? Is there any other reason than mere convenience, why women should so often wear their hats at an in-door social function, when men do not? And when it comes to *public* functions, why do we have parades and flag-raisings, dedication ceremonies, such as unveilings, corner stone layings, launchings and the like? This matter of the *mores* is one to which, from the very nature of the case, we give very little thought.

The routine of the *Intichiuma* ceremony among the Arunta of Australia and the routine of the large packing-house establishments of Chicago are both intended to increase the food supply, and yet one would have difficulty in discovering any resemblance between them, unless it be in the copious spilling of blood.[2] The one consists of a series of elaborate ceremonies, and from the other anything resembling ceremony has been entirely eliminated.

Our modern economic parlance has given us a pass-word and a proverb. The pass-word, which will ensure entrance into any commercial or industrial stronghold, and procure promotion for its lucky possessor, is "efficiency." And the proverb, which serves as a cloak to cover many sins, is "Corporations have no souls." Both of them reflect our modern emphasis on mechanism to the exclusion of personality. The modern workman "runs" a machine or does such work as a machine can not do, but he does it *like a machine*. His very motions are prescribed, the way in which he should lift a burden, the height and distance from him at which his materials should be placed, the sequence of his motions, all these are figured out for him, beforehand, or may be, if he is properly "managed."[3] Nothing could more accurately illustrate the change from savagery to civilization

[2] Spencer and Gillen. *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 176 ff. On the use of human-blood, *cf. G. B.*, I. p. 90 ff.

[3] Taylor, F. W. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. (N. Y., 1911).

than this contrast of "technique." Another example of the same thing may be found in the difference of procedure necessary to win one's way into the presence of a savage potentate and that of an industrial magnate. The minor details may be left to the imagination, but in general, that which would characterize the one would be totally lacking from the other. There would no doubt be much vexatious delay in both cases, and many requirements which might not be understood; at least their necessity would not be obvious at the time. In the one case, the whole procedure would be a matter of ceremony, and when one was finally ushered into the august presence, he would be received with haughty but magnanimous courtesy and the proffer of entertainment and refreshment. In the other, ceremony would be conspicuous by its absence, its place being taken by system, and if courtesy did not give place to curtness, the most one could expect would be a greeting somewhat after the manner of "Well, I have just fifteen minutes; what can I do for you?"

In all primitive groups most of the government and much of the education is done by the use of ceremonies. We have seen an example of the education of the young natives of Australia, by means of the initiation ceremony,[4] and in order to illustrate the use of ceremony in a more evident case of social control, let us quote from the same authority the description of an execution of the death sentence.

"When a man has been adjudged by the council to have killed some one by evil magic, an armed party called *Pinya* is sent out to kill him.

"The appearance at a camp of one or more natives marked with a white band round the head, with the point of the beard tipped with human hair, and with diagonal red and white stripes across the breast and stomach, is the sign of

[4] *supra* p. 16 ff.

the *Pinya*. These men do not speak, and their appearance is a warning to the camp to listen attentively to the questions they may think it necessary to put regarding the whereabouts of the condemned man. Knowing the discipline of the *Pinya* and its remorseless spirit, any and every question is answered in terror, and many a cowardly man in his fear accuses his friend or even his relative, and it is on this accusation that the *Pinya* throw the whole of the responsibility of the death they inflict. When the deed is done, the *Pinya* is broken up, and each man returns to his home." [5] Mr. Howitt goes on to describe the visit of a *Pinya* to avenge a death, which, from the description seems to have been accidental, but which was nevertheless considered worthy of retributive justice. As the custom of the Dieri is that the penalty of death shall be inflicted, not necessarily on the *offender,* but on his eldest brother at the place where the offence was committed, in this instance it fell on an innocent kinsman. The leader of the *Pinya* of Perigundi men was called Mudla-kupa. When he pronounced the sentence of death over the offender, "an elder brother of this man drew Mudla-kupa to one side, saying, 'Don't seize my Ngatata (younger brother), nor even me, for see, there sits our Neyi (elder brother); seize him.' At the same time he threw a clod of earth in the direction in which the man was. Mudla-kupa now turned to him, seized him by the hand, and spoke the death sentence over him, which he received with stoical composure. Mudla-kupa led him to one side, when the second man of the *Pinya* came up, and as Mudla-kupa held the man out to him as the accused, he struck him with a *maru-wiri* [6] and split his head open. The whole *Pinya* then fell upon him with spears and boomerangs. In order that they should not hear how he was being killed, the other

[5] Howitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 326-328.

[6] "A weapon shaped like a great boomerang, which is used with both hands like a sword."

men, women, and children in the camp made a great rustling with boughs and broken-off bushes."

How can it have come to pass that a few daubs of paint across the chest and a white band round the head could so fortify a small group of men that they could walk silently into the camp of another clan and calmly split the head of one of its men without resistance? Or, what is even more remarkable, what mysterious power forced an innocent man to sit calmly by and watch his own execution, so to speak, and his relatives to treat the whole affair like a social *faux-pas* from which attention should be directed by any means at hand? It is to answer questions like these that we are forced to consider the *origin* of ceremony, but since their history can never be *traced* back of some legendary past in which they were already established and in full control, we are forced to *surmise* their origin, on the basis of human psychology, a basis, it may be said, on which we can come much nearer to demonstration and the discovery of solid fact, than on the testimony of either historians or the aborigines themselves.

It is to be distinctly understood that we here launch out into theory, but it is not *pure* theory alone, but an attempt at the interpretation of *facts* which any one can verify for himself. We must not—in fact we *need* not—assume anything as being present in the "nature" of the savage that we are not conscious of as being also present in ourselves. Not that I mean to suggest that we all are savages, but only that we ourselves possess a native endowment of instincts and emotions which are the common heritage of all mankind.[7] These represent that part of human nature which changes least, if at all, and so constitute the major premise of our theorizing. Our only other assumption,—and this consti-

[7] *vide* Shand, A. F., *The Foundations of Character*, (Lond., 1914), esp. Bk. II, Chap. 1, "Instincts and Emotions," pp. 178-196.

tutes our minor premise, if it may be so called where we do not employ a syllogism,—is that the ideas of primitive man were the product of his environment; and here again we may demonstrate the truth of our assumption ourselves.[8]

Primitive man needed knowledge and control, and sought these as aids in his struggle for self-preservation. He probably did not have any idea of law or regularity, but accepted the presence of things around him and the succession of day and night much as young children do. When anything unusual or irregular happened, this attracted his attention and filled him with fear. Now what we popularly call fear is apparently made up of two elements: an instinctive reaction of flight and an emotion or effective "tone" accompanying it. When we *speak* of fear or try to describe it we usually think of the latter, but the way others discover that we are afraid is by the evidence of the former. We need not stop to discuss their possible separation in *theory* since in experience they always occur together, and we may be permitted, for the purposes of our argument, to treat them both as innate or "given." [9] If when one is frightened—or rather *ought* to be frightened—he should suddenly dash off at top speed, like a base-runner in a ball game "getting down with his arm" as the pitcher moves, or with as little hesitation as

[8] "The difference in the mode of thought of primitive man and of civilized man seems to consist largely in the difference of character of the traditional material with which the new perception associates itself." *Boas, op. cit.* p. 7.

[9] The latest word from the "Behaviourist" school is "that all organized responses which can be called forth from both man and animal fall under one or the other of these heads, instincts (including here the simplest form of reflexes), and habits. * * * Since we do not admit any such distinction" (as that made by James between the motor response to emotions and instincts) "it follows that from our point of view both emotions and instincts belong in one and the same class." Watson, J. B., *Behaviour* (N. Y., 1914), p. 185 n.; cf. McDougal, W., *Introduction to Social Psychology*, (6th ed., Boston, 1912), chap. 3.

is manifested by little chicks when, at the sight of a passing shadow the brood-hen utters that peculiar little gurgle which so impressed the mind of the Psalmist and of Christ, in all probability he would not be *afraid* at all, but would enjoy the exhilaration of the exercise as much as a colt frisking round in a pasture; and he would have as little understanding as to *why* he did it. It is just because we do *not* run at once, but hesitate about it, that we are overtaken by fear. This hesitation may be due to our being "paralyzed" by the fear, or it may be due, in part at least, to an element of curiosity which prompts us to "take a chance" and see what will happen. Both fear and curiosity are common to man and the other animals, but while in the animals fear and curiosity are opposed, antagonistic and tend to be mutually exclusive, in man they can be, and often are combined or blended into one attitude. Because primitive man wanted to *know,* he bargained with fear, and because he wanted to be master both of himself and of his world, he dared to make an *attempt* at mastering a difficult situation, and somehow or other he *succeeded!*

Surely it is significant that, so far as we can discover, the animals have no *ceremonies,* though we may often notice suggestions of such in their behaviour.[10] In spite of the wonderful abilities displayed by some animals in learning to perform a definite series of acts which shall lead to a result which remains constant, this accomplishment seems to lack any element of adaptation *to the end in view.* It is only in man that we find undoubted evidence of this anticipatory adjustment, and the ability to accomplish this is what we call mind.[11] If, then, we find that the two possessions which

[10] Groos, K., *The Play of Animals,* (N. Y. 1898), refers to the seeming dances of birds, which he relates to courtship: pp. 109, 268.

[11] "When the psychologist threw away the soul he compromised with his conscience by setting up a 'mind' which was

distinguish man from the animals—and this conclusion is based on the personal testimony of both—are the use of ceremonies and the ability to make what we call deliberate adaptation of means to ends, there would seem to be at least a reasonable probability that there is some connection between the two.

Dr. Marett has a very suggestive illustration of how the use of symbolic substitutes, so common in all forms of magic, may have arisen. He calls attention to the fact that when a bull attempts, in a rage—which is preponderant in directing his interest—to gore a man, the sight of whom has provoked the outburst of rage, the animal will attack the man's discarded coat in lieu of the man if he can reach the one and not the other.[12] It is this very fact that lends the zest to the Spanish bull fights, and robs them of most of their danger. In such a case we have no means of determining whether the bull finds any real connection between the original cause of the danger and the object on which it vents itself, but the transfer from one to the other takes place almost automatically. "And now to pass from the case of the animal to that of man, in regard to whom a certain measure of sympathetic insight becomes possible. With a fury that well-nigh matches the bull's in its narrowing effect on the consciousness, the lover, who yesterday perhaps was kissing the treasured glove of his mistress, to-day, being jilted, casts her portrait on the fire." [13] Here we have a clear case of "rudimentary magic." There may not be, in the mind of the lover, any intention to work harm on his fair lady, but for the time being he is in exactly the frame of mind which would lead him to a conviction that he *had* done so, if, in the next day's paper he discovered the news that her house

---

to remain always hidden and difficult of access." Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[12] *op. cit.*, p. 40.

[13] *ibid.*

had caught fire the night before, and she had perished in the flames. His whole attention is, for the moment, riveted on the "symbol" which has completely displaced the reality which it represents, and his action is as involuntary as if he were under hypnotic control. Subsequently he would no doubt "explain" this action, and find rational justification for it, but *at the time there was none.*

There are other ways in which the same sort of action may come to expression. "You get a letter that hurts you, you tear it up instantly. You do this not because you think you are tearing up the writer, but just because you are hurt, and hurt nerves seek muscular discharge. You get a letter that heals you and you keep it, you hold it tight in your hand, you even, if you are a real savage, put it to your lips, simply because you act on the instinct to clutch what is life to you." [14]

"Man, say the wise Upanishads, is altogether desire (*káma*); as is his desire so is his insight (*kratu*), as is his insight so is his deed (*karma.*) This oneness of desire and deed, which the Indian mystic emphasizes, comes out very clearly in the simplest forms of magic when the magical act is only an uttered desire. You are becalmed, you can do nothing, think of nothing but the wind that will not come. The thought of it possesses you, obsesses you, till the tension of your nerves is too much, your longing will out; the wind will not whistle for you, you whistle for the wind. Your first whistle is sheer, incarnate longing, but, as it came after long waiting, perhaps the wind really does rise. Next time the nerve paths are ready prepared,[15] a habit is set up,

---

[14] *Themis*, p. 83.

[15] "It is assumed by a good many writers, * * * that there is an 'overflow' or 'diffusion phenomenon' and this diffusion or overflow can spread without having to pass through *preformed neural channels.* In this accidental connections are said to be

a private, it may be public, ritual is inaugurated." [16] Whatever may have been the original cause of the action, whether it be an instinctive expression of emotion, such as fear or anger, or the overt embodiment of a strong desire, the point which I wish to emphasize is that the expression is a perfectly natural and spontaneous one, and we are at once on the road toward the establishment of a habit. It is a well established fact of neural physiology that once a thing has been done, it comes easier to the individual to *repeat* the same process than to try some *new* way of doing it. It may take a great many trials to establish this particular method, to the exlusion of all others, but the first method to bring about the desired result has the best chance of winning *in the end.*

So long as we are dealing with individuals alone it is merely a question of the primary instinctive reactions, or tendencies to respond to certain external stimuli, and the possibility of the successful response being repeated often enough to gradually exclude all *other* instinctive reactions to the same stimulus, which can influence the establishment of a habit.[17] But since an "individual" is a pure abstraction, and we must consider the influence upon him of the folk among whom he lives, it is evident that we must consider the possibility of the development of habits or their modification by social influence.

Chickens are born with the instinct to peck, and at first will peck at *anything,* but the rapidity with which the *habit*

made and bonds or associations to be established. But we have tried to point out in several places *that the nervous system is not built to permit such functions.* There is no formation of new pathways. (It is quite probable that the difficulty here is one mainly of terminology.)" Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

[16] *Themis*, p. 83.

[17] The *recency* of the successful attempt, when the same situation arises again, with the possibility of what we call "memory" also has its effect, but this is less potent. cf. Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 262 ff.; Angell *Psychology*, (4th ed. N. Y., 1908), pp. 237 ff.

develops is greatly increased by the influence of the brood hen's presence. An English sparrow, reared in the company of canaries developed, in one instance at least, the ability to reproduce some of the canaries' notes, while a red-wing blackbird that had the privilege of living in a cosmopolitan aviary cultivated the crow of a bantam rooster and made it the burden of his song for two whole months.[18] Now it is easy to see how a kind of social sanction might soon lend to an *individual's* habit the prestige of a *social* convention. Individual expression under social control leads to convention. When you have been fishing, have you ever seen anyone spit on his bait? If so were you enough of a savage to try it yourself? You would probably not attribute the next catch that you made to this expedient, but in an ignorant community the testimony of one individual to the positive value of such an act might easily lead to a sort of fisherman's magic. And while we are speaking of fishing, have you never waded *silently* along a country trout brook, because, forsooth, the trout would not bite if you *spoke?* I have; and an utterly illogical proceeding it was, too, but we caught the trout!

Primitive peoples know nothing of experimentation, but they put great faith in experience—anyone's and everyone's experience. The only instruction that the child among the uncivilized receives is folk-lore and tradition, which are the accumulated experience of the past. We have already called attention to the great difference between our traditions, which embody all the lore of the ancient past—mingled with the scientific knowledge of the last few centuries, and the traditions of the savage. But we need to emphasize this again for none of us sufficiently realizes, in our vaunted superiority to the savage, how much richer is our inheritance than his, and of its riches how large a part we *owe to him!* He, like

[18] Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

us, assumes as true the traditions of the past, but because his traditions are different from ours, because any new experience brings with it an entirely different train of associations, his *conclusions* can not help being different, and the explanations which he accepts often seem to us ridiculous.[19] We may assume, then, that somehow, on the basis of the natural reactions which we have described, an expedient has been hit upon by an individual under the stress of perplexity, and that this expedient has removed his fear and tided him over the danger, or has appeared to him to have been a factor in the supplying of his need. What actually happens is that the particular expedient will have so dominated his consciousness at the time of suspense and emotional stress that it will have become inseparably associated [20] with the final outcome. As a result of this association, the expedient, as a whole, or some particular element of it, such as a particular action or some specific thing, will assume two important characteristics, one emotional, one practical. Since we are going back, in imagination, to the *genesis* of ceremonial, the probability is that the supposed problem proceeded out of one of the most primary needs, *i. e.* was related to the food or sex instinct, and was necessarily of great practical importance. Hence this discovery, because it helped to supply this practical need, will now assume a great practical value. Should the same

[19] On this point *cf.* again Boas' paper, already referred to; also W. I. Thomas, "The Mind of Woman and the Lower Races," in *Sex and Society* (Chicago, 1913), pp. 251 ff; John Dewey, "Interpretation of Savage Mind" in *Psychological Review*, IX. (1902), pp. 217 ff.

[20] Association of *ideas* is always subsequent to association in experience or conduct. It does not account for our thinking merely to refer it to association, for the association itself must have a source and meaning. *cf. Marett, op. cit.*, p. 83; Boas, *Mind of Prim. Man*, pp. 237 ff.; on the physiological basis of association *vide* James, *Principles of Psychology*, (N. Y., 1899), I. 550 ff.

need arise again, the probability is that the attempt will be made to supply it again in the same way. But even should a similar problem never again present itself, there will be an emotional element in the memory of the experience which will impart to the expedient a certain value. Either of these would be a firm foundation for a traditional employment of this particular procedure under certain circumstances. The more often any act is repeated the more firmly it becomes established, and the more nearly habitual it becomes, the less deliberate and conscious it will be. But with this decrease of conscious accompaniment comes a decided increase in the emotional reaction which will result if it be omitted. Not to have done it will produce a consciousness of something being wrong, of some shortcoming; a feling of disquiet and foreboding. If you have ever left out your tooth-brush when packing for a journey, without *knowing* that you had done so, you will appreciate this feeling. Whether this particular reaction to an actual need, which we assume has occurred fortuitously, will be repeated often enough to develop into a habit or not, there will at least be a *tendency,* as a result of its having been once performed, to repeat it if occasion demands; and if it thus becomes established as a habit, with the more or less unconscious, *un*-rational and automatic character of habits, its subsequent omission, either by chance or deliberately, will cause an emotional reaction or sense of "wrong doing" which must certainly provoke the suspicion that such omission may be followed by some untoward event, and the establishment of this particular act as a ceremony incumbent on everyone.

It is just here that social influences take a hand in the making of a ceremonial, and once the necessary "social sanction" is procured, the ceremony is established. It does not seem to grow, but to "appear" full fledged and in a position of social control. Nothing can thus become established as a ceremony, which is not in accord with those customs and

traditions which are already established, and this often leads to the most peculiar traditions and aetiological myths which accompany the fusion of partially conflicting cult practices and ceremonies. We are here considering, however, only the possibility of some particular practice, which has sprung up very naturally from the reaction of some individual or group of persons to a particular problem of conduct, subsequently becoming established as a "ceremony" that is generally recognized as such and is universally employed within the social group as a method of accomplishing the desired result. All that is necessary to bring about this result, is for the group sentiment to fasten upon it and compel its observance.

A ceremony is a mysterious thing. It "grips" you. A few raps of the chairman's gavel transform a medley of conversation into an impressive silence, the wig and gown of the judge and the "hear ye! hear ye!" of the court crier *make* the solemnity of the court, and the lights and incense of religious ceremonial leave an odor which clings to a Catholic place of worship and impresses you with a sense of its peculiarly religious atmosphere, the minute you step inside its doors.

A ceremony is always a *social* thing, for it is a method that persons have of dealing with *persons* or with things—as *we* might call them—which are nevertheless treated *as* persons. It is not the dead and mechanical thing that it is sometimes supposed to be, but is instinct with *life,* and treats all that take part in it or come within the field of its influence as though they were animated by the same spirit. Ceremony is, furthermore, socialized habit. It grows out of a common agreement in some particular purpose or desire, and constitutes a method of accomplishing something in which all the participants have a common interest. It is the expression of *one* idea and springs naturally out of the common life of a group of persons who make up some sort of social unit.

IV

THE CHARACTER OF MAGIC

Most people would probably agree with Dr. Frazer in considering magic and religion fundamentally opposed to each other, and yet, if they could tell you just why they thought so, there would most certainly be a wide divergence in their reasons. One cause of this would be a rather hazy idea as to what magic is. In this day and generation we have almost lost sight of it, but in a general way we may understand it to mean the use of some mysterious implements, gestures and *formulae*[1] to bring about a desired result, no matter what this may be. Now this is just the sort of thing that we have been describing numerous examples of, and no doubt the question has more than once arisen in the mind of the reader, whether such practices could be regarded as in any sense religious. Dr. Frazer thinks not, and therefore concludes that there must have been a time during which mankind resorted to this sort of magical practice to accomplish a much desired control of his environment, and only subsequently, when he began to discover the futility of it, did he turn from magic to religion.[2] Whether we shall eventually agree in this opinion or not, it is essential that we should realize that primitive man seems everywhere to have begun with the use of certain ceremonies by which he believed he could control the sources of life and the processes of nature, and it is this that is usually called magic.

[1] It seems fairly well established that the origin of the familiar expression "hocus pocus" is to be found in the "*Hoc est Corpus meum*" of the Latin Canon of the Mass.

[2] *op. cit.*, I. pp. 233-238.

Out of all the examples that might be chosen to give us an idea of the motive and general procedure of such ceremonies, perhaps none is better than the producing of rain, since today, though there are still many Christian people who earnestly pray for rain in times of drought, they are sometimes thought to be "over superstitious" by their more weak-hearted neighbors. The following description of the rain making ceremonies of the Dieri tribe of Central Australia, is given by Howitt, on the authority of Mr. Gason, who had witnessed them many times.[3]

"When the great council has determined that such a ceremony is to be held, women, accompanied by their *Pirraurus*[4] are sent off to the various subdivisions of the tribe, to summon the people to attend at some appointed place. When the tribe is gathered together, they dig a hole about two feet deep, twelve long, and from eight to ten feet wide. Over this they build a net of logs with the interstices filled in with slighter logs, the building being conical in form and covered with boughs. This hut is only sufficiently large to contain the old men, the younger ones being seated at the entrance or outside. This being completed, the women are called together to look at the hut, which they approach from the rear, and then separating, some go one way and some the other round the building, until they reach the entrance, each one looking inside without speaking. They then return to their camp, about five hundred yards distant.

Two *Kunkis*,[5] who are supposed to have received an in-

---

[3] Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia.* (London, 1904), p. 395-396. *cf.* Gason, S. "Manners and Customs of the Dieyerie Tribe," in Woods, J. D., Editor, *Native Tribes of South Australia*, (Adelaide, 1879), and Frazer, *op. cit.*, I. 255 ff., for summary.

[4] *i. e.*, a wife's sister or a husband's brother; a kind of "secondary" wife or husband.

[5] Medicine-men.

spiration from the rain-making *Mura-muras,*[6] are selected to have their arms lanced. These are tightly bound near the shoulders to prevent a too profuse effusion of blood. This being done, all the old men huddle together in the hut, and the principal *Kunki* of the tribe bleeds each of the men inside the arm below the elbow with a sharp piece of flint. The blood is made to flow on the men sitting round, during which the two *Kunkis* throw handfuls of down into the air, some of which becomes attached to the blood on the man, while some still floats about. The blood is to symbolize the rain, and the down the clouds. Two large stones are placed in the center of the hut, representing gathering clouds presaging rain. The women are now called to visit the hut again, and after having looked in and seen the inmates, they return to their camp.

"The main part of the rain-making ceremony being now concluded, the men who were bled carry away the two stones and place them as high as possible in the branches of the largest tree about. In the meantime the other men gather gypsum, pound it fine and throw it into a water-hole. The *Mura-mura* is supposed to see this, and thereupon to cause the clouds to appear in the sky. Should no clouds appear as soon as expected, the explanation given is that the *Mura-mura* is angry with them; and should there be no rain for weeks or months after the rain-making ceremony, they suppose that some other tribe has stopped their power.

"After the ceremony, the hut is thrown down by the men, old and young butting at it with their heads. The heavier logs which withstand this are pulled down by dragging at the bottom end. The piercing the hut with their heads symbolizes the piercing of the clouds, and the fall of the hut symbolizes that of the rain." While this is almost pure magic, there is a suggestion of that "propitiation or concilia-

[6] Their legendary ancestors.

tion of powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and of human life" [7] which Dr. Frazer considers the essential thing in religion, and he would probably class it as an instance of the "fusion or confusion" of the two.[8] He gives another example of a similar ceremony from Queensland, in which a "rain-stick" takes a prominent part, and which in no way suggests the intervention of a supernatural being. "About noon the men who are to take part in it repair to a lonely pool, into which one of them dives and fixes a hollow log vertically in the mud. Then they all go into the water, and, forming a rough circle around the man in the middle, who holds the rain-stick aloft, they begin stamping with their feet as well as they can, and splashing the water with their hands from all sides on the rain-stick. The stamping, which is accompanied by singing, is sometimes a matter of difficulty, since the water may be four feet deep or more. When the singing is over, the man in the middle dives out of sight and attaches the rain-stick to the hollow log under water. Then coming to the surface, he quickly climbs on to the bank and spits out on dry land the water which he imbibed in diving. * * * No woman may set eyes on the rain-stick or witness the ceremony of its submergence; but the wife of the chief rain-maker is privileged to take part in the subsequent rite of scratching herself with a twig. When the rain does come, the rain-stick is taken out of the water; it has done its work." [9] By way of contrast, and to show that we have not, even today, quite outgrown magic—should anyone think that we have—consider the following "present day ceremony" from the same authority:[10] "In time of drought the Servians strip a girl to her skin and

---

[7] See the definition of religion in *G. B.*, I. p. 222, where it is attributed to Cicero, *De Inventione*, ii. 161.

[8] *cf. G. B.*, I. p. 227.

[9] *op. cit.*, I. p. 254-255.

[10] *ibid.*, p. 273.

clothe her from head to foot in grass, herbs, and flowers, even her face being hidden behind a veil of living green.

"Thus disguised she is called Dodola, and goes through the village with a troop of girls. They stop before every house; the Dodola keeps turning herself round and dancing, while the other girls form a ring about her singing one of the Dodola songs, and the housewife pours a pail of water over her. One of the songs they sing runs thus:—

> We go through the village;
> The clouds go through the sky;
> We go faster,
> Faster go the clouds;
> They have overtaken us,
> And wetted the corn and the vine."

It is perhaps well for the besoused maiden that such charms are not resorted to except in that season of the year when the desired result is considered to be *possible,* or in fact would be a normal occurrence.[11]

Turning now to another side of magic, let us notice an instructive example of that sort of magic which is both private, as contrasted with social, and anti-social in that it seeks another's injury. This ceremony is called "pointing with the bone" and is thus described.[12] "In North Australia any one can 'sing magic' even *lubras* (women), but of course the wise old magic men do it best. It never fails with them,

---

[11] *cf.* Haddon, A. C., *Magic and Fetishism,* (Chicago, n. d.) p. 62. He says "I found that the *impossible* was never attempted. A rain charm would not be made when there was no expectation of rain coming, or a south-east wind be raised during the wrong season."

[12] *apud* Haddon, *op. cit.,* p. 49-50, where it is abridged from Gunn, Jeannie, *The Little Black Princess; a True Tale of Life in the Never-Never Land,* (London, 1905), p. 98. This ceremony is also described in Howitt, *op. cit.,* p. 359 ff.

particularly if they 'sing' and point one of the special 'death-bones' or 'sacred stones' of the tribe. Generally a black fellow goes away quite by himself when he is 'singing magic' but very occasionally a few men join together, as they did in the case of 'Goggle Eye.' When enough magic has been 'sung' into the bone, it is taken away to the camp, and very secretly pointed at the unconscious victim. The magic spirit of the bone runs into the man who is pointed at, and gradually kills him. Of course the man who has been 'sung' must be told somehow, or he will not get a fright and die. There are many ways of managing this; one very good way is to put the bone where he will be sure to find it, in his dilly-bag, or near his fire, or through the handle of his spear; but the man who leaves the bone about must, of course, be very careful to destroy his own tracks.[13] 'Goggle-Eye,' after he had found the bones lying about, knew exactly what was going to happen to him, and of course it did. His throat got very sore, and he grew so thin and weak that he could hardly stand. A man can be cured by magic men charming the 'bone' away again; but 'Goggle-Eye' was old, and, what was worse, he was getting very cross, and too fond of ordering people about, so the black fellows thought it would be the best plan not to cure him, and a few more sneaked away into the bush and 'sang' some more bones, and pointed them at him to make quite sure about his dying. Poor old 'Google-Eye' suffered dreadfully; no native would help him except his blood-brother, because they were afraid of the curse coming to them. Some said they would like to help, but that if they made 'Goggle-Eye's' fire for him, their own would never burn again. Nobody could even carry his food to him. Soon after, at 'fowl-sing-out,' or cock-crow, he died."

[13] This is because he might himself be killed by putting "medicine" in his foot-prints. *cf. G. B.* I. p. 207-212.

Innumerable examples of these and other kinds of magic rites could be given, but I must resist the temptation to do so, and will add but one more, which will illustrate another side of magical practice, in the way of a personal "charm" as we might call it. This instance is found among the traditions of the Cherokee Indians.[14] In order to fortify himself against the rigors of the cold, before starting on a journey the Cherokee rubs his feet with ashes from his fire, and then sings four verses. Each of these verses consists of the declaration that he *becomes,* in reality a wolf, a deer, a fox and an oppossum, and after each he imitates in voice and gesture the particular animal which he at the moment *is.* In this way he procures for his own feet that immunity from frost-bite which these animals apparently possess.

Since it is not an easy matter to *define* magic, I have tried to illustrate it, and I believe that all its salient features are evident in the few examples here given. Fundamentally and primarily it is a means to a coercive sort of control, or "the exertion of an imperative will," as it has been called.[15] This it accomplishes by the use of certain definite and fixed ritual acts and verbal formulae, nothing of which may be omitted. Normally it requires the use of both material objects and spoken words, and where the "object" or victim is a person, some knowledge on his part, that the performance has taken place is essential to its success. It seems almost a truism, but nevertheless the fact must be emphasized that absolute confidence in the efficacy of the means chosen is an indispensable requisite, particularly on the part of a personal *victim.* The one outstanding thing about magic is that it is

[14] Mooney, J., "Myths of the Cherokee," *Bureau of American Ethnology, Report* XIX. (Wash., D. C., 1900), Pt. I. p. 266.

[15] Marett, *Threshhold of Religion,* 2d. ed., p. 69. I am indebted to Dr. Marett for my conviction that magic was not a rudimentary *natural* science. This he shows here, in "From Spell to Prayer," a criticism of Frazer's view.

a way of getting things *done,* and if it is first-class magic it always "works." What it really resolves itself into is a method of pre-enacting the thing before it comes off,[16] and it is important to remember that though the final result of the magic rite is in this way determined by the rite itself, you can never be *quite certain* that the desired result will follow, till it *does.* The "rainstick" was not taken from the water hole till *after* the rain had come, and then there could be no question that it had done its work! If, for any untoward circumstance, the desired result does *not* follow, it is quite remarkable that, contrary to what *we* might expect, the principle of magic does not fall into disrepute, there is no loss of confidence in the technique as such, but the failure is attributed to one of two causes: either there has been some *lack* in the perfection of the rite, some undiscovered hindrance, or the reason is to be found in some contrary magic or counter spell. We found a suggestion of this in the account of the rain-making ceremony of the Dieri.[17]

There are two elements in this "doing" of magic, the expression of the operator's will in the present symbolism, and the realization of the same will in the ultimate result. Between these two and linking them into a potent whole lies the wonderful and mysterious power which lends to magic

---

[16] "First and foremost magic is δρώμενον, a thing predone. The rain-maker jingles his rattle and shakes his water-cart, he *does* something. Language here speaks clearly enough. The Latin *factura* is magical 'making', witchcraft; the Sanskrit *krtya* is doing and magic; the Greek ἐργάξεσθαι is used of ritual operations of a magical character. The German *zauber* is connected with the O. H. G. *zouwan,* Gothic *tanyan,* to do. The doing is sometimes that form of doing which we call speaking; γόης the Greek enchanter, is but a specialized howler; the Hebrew *dabar* does not distinguish between word and deed. Of whatever kind the action, the essence of magic is

I'll do, I'll do, I'll do." (*Themis,* p. 82)

[17] *supra* p. 56.

its terror. It is about this mysterious "something" in magic that the scholars are still disputing, but we need not tarry over their arguments, since for our purpose it does not matter what the savages or the ancients *thought* it was—if this can ever be settled—provided only that we appreciate that it was *real,* not simply imaginary. And if you do not believe this, stand at a grade crossing on some rail-road, when a train is approaching and wave a piece of red cloth about a yard square (I am not certain as to the precise *size,* but it *must be red*) frantically back and forth *across* the track and see what happens! Or you might try crying just one magic word, shrilly and at the top of your voice, in a crowded theatre: FIRE!!! This is said always to produce the same effect, but I can not vouch for it, as I have never tried it.

This mystic power was set loose, as it were, and directed on its way by the magic rite combined with the "spell," and if something did not intervene between this "spiritual projectile"[18] and its target, it was bound to hit. There was always, however, an element of suspense, represented by that *pregnant if,* which lifted the whole proceeding out of the natural and commonplace and exalted it into a thing of foreboding and terror. Magic was essentially a means of gaining control, of obtaining *power* and exerting it for the furtherance of one's own ends, and yet it is not at all certain that it was in any sense a *mechanical* process. It may look so to us, because we are familiar with mechanism, an inert, inanimate thing which has to be put to work, but is almost wholly self-directed and under unvarying conditions, will always produce the same results. But even the thought of mechanism, as thus defined, shows how far its action differs from the action of magic. There is an unquestionable attitude of deliberate control, but it seems to be commen-

[18] The term is Marett's; *vide op. cit.,* p. 54. My indebtedness to Dr. Marett for this and the psychological analysis of magic is gratefully acknowledged.

surate with a sense of the mysteriously occult and problematical rather than with a conviction of natural law or mechanical uniformity which must govern the result. And it does not require a disregard of another will in the "object" but only the coercion of this will. Whether or not primitive man conceived of the forces of nature as "personal," or directed by anything like "will," there can be no doubt that when he used a magic rite to win the love of a maiden or contrive the death of an enemy he must have admitted to them just as much of a will as he himself had. The important point is to realize that by the use of his magic he was able—generally—to thwart it. No doubt old "Goggle-Eye" had no particular *desire* to die, but like the Scotchman's wife, who being a good Calvinist, found consolation in the doctrine of God's immutable decrees, even on her deathbed, had to be "reconciled." In each case it was a firm conviction that the end was inevitable, which made the reconciliation possible, but the human will was not ignored, nor was it destroyed, it *acquiesced*.

I have searched in vain for a clear and comprehensive definition of magic [19] and in view of the reticence of the

[19] The nearest to a concise definition that I have found, is that of Hewett (*Amer. Anthropologist*, New Series, IV. p. 37): "an imitative representation or dramatization, so to speak, of the operations of the mystic potence subsumed in the environing bodies."

For a resume of the various *theories* of magic, *vide* Hartland, E. S., *Ritual and Belief*, (N. Y., 1914), pp. 68ff.

The origin of magic is attributed by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* XXX. 7) to Persia, meaning by this the Magi.

Even in the last edition of the *Golden Bough*, the first two volumes of which treat of "The Magic Art" Dr. Frazer has no definition, in the *inclusive* sense. He says: "In short, magic is a spurious system of natural law as well as a fallacious guide of conduct; it is a false science as well as an abortive art, * * * It may be called Theoretical Magic; * * * (or) it may be called Practical Magic. At the same time it is to be borne in

authorities on the subject, hesitate to frame one of my own. But I may venture to sum up the foregoing discussion by

---

mind that the primitive magician knows magic only on its practical side; he never analyzes the mental processes * * * reflects on the abstract principles involved in his actions. * * * to him magic is always an art, never a science; the very idea of science is lacking in his undeveloped mind. It is for the philosophic student to trace the train of thought * * * to disengage the abstract thought * * * in short to discern the spurious science behind the bastard art." (*op. cit.*, I. p. 53). The intellectualistic point of view here is patent. Marett says: "Even as regards the use of the term 'magic,' which a student of rudimentary religion is bound to define somewhat sharply, since it gives him his natural counterfoil, I have tried to allow for the popular use of the word, which is liberal to the point of laxity. Hence in certain contexts I may have failed to give it the meaning I would prefer it to bear, namely, that of, not the impersonal, but the bad kind of supernaturalism; the impersonal and the bad kinds by no means always coinciding, if my theory of the possibility of a pre-animistic, or, as others would say, 'dynamistic,' type of religion be correct." (*op. cit.*, p. xxx.)

Ames (*Psychology of Religious Experience*, Boston, 1910, p. 79) says: "Instead of attempting to define magic it is more profitable to indicate some things designated by it without insisting that they exhaust its possible meanings."

Prof. Ames finds the distinction between magic and religion in the *social* character of the latter: "The religious ceremonials, requiring, as they do, the coöperation of the group, may be regarded as collective magic; while those practices which are commonly designated magic may be distinguished as individual magic." (*ibid.*) Somewhat similar is the view of Doutté (*Magie et Religion*, Alger, 1909, p. 338): "Autrement dit, le miracle est une sorcellerie légitime et la sorcellerie est une miracle defendu." *cf.* "mais nous estimons que la magie envellopait les duex à l' origine: car au commencement la religion, comme la sorcellerie, était une magie." (*ibid.* p. 341.)

We fail to realize, I think, how much we owe to the Primitive conception of magic. Rivers, (*The Todas*, Lond. 1906, p. 271) says that while the Todas use the same formula to cure both "natural" ills and those supposed to be due to magic, they have reached that stage of advancement where "we seem to have a

saying that so far as I understand it, magic appears to be the deliberate use of a traditional rite for the purpose of mysteriously enforcing the will of the operator upon the "object." As we have already pointed out, the difficulty which such a statement leaves us to face is that of distinguishing magic from religion, and great as this difficulty is, even on Frazer's theory, we must face it. Frazer is forced to admit that the "antagonism" between magic and religion, which he considers *fundamental,* did not appear till "comparatively late in the history of religion," [20] and what is even more surprising, in spite of this antagonism the *confusion* of the two survives even in our own day, and among peoples "of higher culture." [21] To this question of the *difference* between religion and magic we must now devote our attention.

---

clear indication of the differentiation between magic and medicine." The same separation is in its inception among the Malay also. (Skeat, W. W., *Malay Magic*, Lond. 1900, p. 56 n. 1.) The relation of the magician and medicine-man is discussed by Prof. Thomas, who finds in him the beginning of the "professional occupations." (*vide Source Book for Social Origins*, Chicago, 1912, pp. 281 ff; also the same article in *Decennial Publications*, Univ. Chic., 1st Series, iv., 241-256.)

But it is not only medicine and the professional occupations which may be found in their incipiency in magic; the conception of *justifiable* homicide, so fundamental in all moral codes appears to come directly out of the belief in the mystical potency of blood to impart impurity and contamination. (*cf.* Farnell, *Evolu. of Relig.*, N. Y., 1905, pp. 139-152; Hewett, J. W., in *Trans. Amer. Philolog. Ass'n*, vol. 41 (1910), pp. 99-114.)

Moreover, the earliest signs of graphic art which we know, are the drawings of the Cave Man, and these are now believed to have been *magical* in their purpose. (Reinach, *Cults, Myths and Religions*, Lond. 1912, pp. 124-237; Hirn, Y., *The Origins of Art*, N. Y., 1900, pp. 257 ff., quoted in "Source Book" *ut supra*, pp. 626 ff.)

[20] *G. B.*, I. 226.

[21] *ibid.* pp. 227 ff.

V

PRIMITIVE RELIGION

ANTHROPOLOGISTS find it difficult, in many cases, to distinguish between magical rites and religious rites, between magicians and priests. Primitive man does almost everything by the use of rites, and the rite produces the desired effect, be it rain or victory, an increase in the food supply or the control of the seasons. Whatever *explanation* he may have himself given of the process by which these results were brought about, does not directly concern their practical value. Results were what he wanted and it was by the constant use of rites that he got them. If there is any real difference between a magic rite and a rite that may properly be called religious, we must seek for it in the difference of attitude which the two reflect, rather than in any merely external differences in the rites themselves. Of course there may be striking changes in the external features of a rite, but we may not assume that therefore, of necessity, the attitude of mind in which it is employed must have changed, unless this very change is apparent in the rite itself. There is a very slight but a very important distinction here. To be of significance, a change in the rite must represent a change in its *meaning,* and therefore we may say that the importance lies not in the details of the outward ceremony, as such, but in the changed attitude which they express.

What I mean by "attitude" may be illustrated from the behavior of two dogs meeting as strangers. One may growl and raise the hair along his back into a bristling ridge, and the other respond in kind, or perhaps show its teeth and tuck its tail between its legs. No explanation of the import

of these gestures is necessary, to us or to the dogs. On the other hand one of the dogs may wag its tail, though the ridge of its back be bristling, while the other crouches with its head close to the ground in the quivering suspense which presages a playful spring. In the two instances there are various ways of expressing two opposing attitudes, and in each case the gestures show an adaptation to what may be expected to be the probable action on the part of the other.[1] An attitude represents possible activity, and where another's action enters into the field of consciousness, it represents also adjustment to the expected action of this other. Modern psychology attempts to discover the subjective experience of an individual, not from the declared opinions of the individual himself or his own explanation of his action, but from the qualities ascribed by him to the corresponding object, or in other words its anticipated or assumed attitude, if the "object" be capable of any reaction in conduct. While, therefore, we may not hope to discover with any certainty the explanations which primitive people gave of their rites, we have a very definite interest in attempting to discover from these rites themselves the kind of "object" they thought themselves to be dealing with, for this will determine our view of their *own* attitudes in using them.

Having directed our attention to this particular feature of mystic rites of all kinds, let us now look at a few examples, which though not in any external elements materially different from those we have already noticed, nevertheless reveal just this element of different attitude.

"In the West African town of Framin, while the Ashantee war was raging some years ago, Mr. Fitzgerald Marriott saw a dance performed by women whose husbands had gone as carriers to the war. They were painted white and wore nothing but a short petticoat. At their head was a shrivelled

[1] I do not here assume conscious adaptation, which would necessitate memory and purpose, but merely instinctive reaction.

old sorceress in a very short white petticoat, her black hair arranged in a sort of long projecting horn, and her black face, breasts, arms, and legs profusely adorned with white circles and crescents. All carried long white brushes made of buffalo or horse tails, and as they danced they sang, "Our husbands have gone to Ashanteeland; may they sweep their enemies off the face of the earth!" [2] Here we have all the characteristics of pure magic, the ceremonial performance with its varied expression in the "spell" constituting a true rite, and the evident intention of the whole, as expressed in the imperative—for such it seems to be, its spirit being equivalent to "Let them conquer!"—being to contrive the overthrow of the enemy.

"In the Kei Islands, when the warriors have departed, the women return indoors and bring out certain baskets containing fruits and stones. These fruits and stones they anoint and place on a board, murmuring as they do so, 'O Lord sun, moon, let the bullets rebound from our husbands, brothers, betrothed, and other relations, just as the raindrops rebound from these objects which are smeared with oil.' As soon as the first shot is heard, the baskets are put aside, and the women, seizing their fans, rush out of the houses. Then, waving their fans in the direction of the enemy, they run through the village, while they sing, 'O golden fans! let our bullets hit, and those of the enemies miss.' "[3] It must be evident to anyone that here there is a different attitude toward the "object." The imperative has passed into the optative,[4] the command into what appears to be of the nature of a supplication.

---

[2] Frazer, *G. B.*, I. p. 132.

[3] *ibid.*, p. 130.

[4] This phrase is borrowed from Marett, as is this contrast of examples, which he suggested, *op. cit.*, pp. 55, 63-67. I add two other illustrations of my own choosing, also culled from the *Golden Bough.*

"In the Babar Archipelago, when a woman desires to have a child, she invites a man who is himself the father of a large family to pray on her behalf to Upulero, the spirit of the sun. A doll is made of red cotton, which the woman clasps in her arms as if she would suckle it. Then the father of many children takes a fowl and holds it by the legs to the woman's head, saying, "O Upulero, make use of the fowl; let fall, let descend a child, I beseech you, I entreat you, let a child fall and descend into my hands and onto my lap." Then he asks the woman, 'Has the child come?' and she answers, 'Yes, it is sucking already.' After that the man holds the fowl on the husband's head, and mumbles some form of words. Lastly, the bird is killed and laid, together with some betel, on the domestic place of sacrifice." [5] Dr. Frazer thinks that "magic is here blent with and reinforced by religion." Not so in the following case, however: "In Saibai, one of the islands in Torres Straits, a similar custom of purely magical character is observed, without any religious alloy." (The words are Frazer's.) "Here, when a woman is pregnant, all the other women assemble. The husband's sister makes an image of a male child and places it before the pregnant woman; afterwards the image is nursed until the birth of the child in order to ensure that the baby shall be a boy." [6]

As yet we have not referred to any of the magic rites for increasing the growth of the crops, so we here notice two such, "tinged" with religion, one from ancient Mexico, the other from modern Germany.

"In ancient Mexico a festival was held in honour of the goddess of maize,[7] or the 'long-haired mother,' as she was called. It began at the time 'when the plant had attained

---

[5] *Golden Bough*, I. p. 72.

[6] *ibid.*

[7] This is, in the last analysis, the earth, the goddess of fertility. In her worship women are always prominent.

its full growth, and fibres shooting forth from the top of the green ear indicated that the grain was fully formed. During the festival the women wore their long hair unbound, shaking and tossing it in the dances which were the chief feature in the ceremonial, in order that the tassel of the maize might grow in like profusion, that the grain might be correspondingly large and flat, and that the people might have abundance.'" [8] No mention is made of either prayer or incantation, but here the rite becomes a sort of acted prayer. In the more modern example the connection with religion seems to be simply one of agglutination resulting from the coincidence of two *kinds* of festival.

"In many parts of Germany and Austria the peasant imagines that he makes the flax grow tall by dancing or leaping high, or by jumping backwards from a table; the higher the leap the taller will the flax be that year. The special season for thus promoting the growth of flax is Shrove Tuesday; but in some places it is Candlemas or Walpurgis Night (the eve of May Day.) The scene of the performance is the flax field, the farmhouse, or the village tavern. In some parts of Eastern Prussia the girls dance one by one in a large hoop at midnight on Shrove Tuesday. The hoop is adorned with leaves, flowers, and ribbons, and attached to it are a small bell and some flax. Strictly speaking the hoop should be wrapped in white linen handkerchiefs, but the place of these is often taken by many coloured bits of cloth, wool, and so forth. While dancing within the hoop each girl has to wave her arms vigorously and cry 'Flax grow!' or words to that effect. When she has done, she leaps out of the hoop, or is lifted out of it by her partner." [9]

---

[8] *G. B.*, I. p. 136; *apud* E. J. Payne, *History of the New World Called America*, (Oxford, 1892), I. p. 421. Miss Harrison refers to the same author in *Themis*, p. 390 ff., where she develops his suggestion of a *sequence* of gods, beginning with Earth.

[9] *G. B.*, I. pp. 138-139.

Before we turn from concrete illustration to discuss the significance of these ceremonials, let us look at two other rain charms. The first of these is from Macedonia, the second from the island of Imbros, off the coast of Thrace near the Gallipoli Peninsula. Both, it should be said, are in use among Orthodox Greek Christians!

"Among the Greeks of Thessaly and Macedonia, when a drought has lasted a long time, it is customary to send a procession of children round to all the wells and springs of the neighborhood. At the head of the procession walks a girl adorned with flowers, whom her companions drench with water at every halting place, while they sing an invocation, of which the following is part:—

> Perperia, all fresh bedewed,
> Freshen all the neighborhood;
> By the woods, on the highway,
> As thou goest, to God now pray:
> O my God, upon the plain,
> Send thou us a still, small rain;
> That the fields may fruitful be,
> And vines in blossom we may see;
> That the grain may be full and sound,
> And wealthy grow the folks around." (10)

The resemblances between this ceremony and the one already referred to among the Servians,[11] are very striking, but the *difference* is no less striking, and vastly more instructive. Superficially viewed the rites are practically identical. They both consist of dancing and singing maidens, one of whom is clothed in vegetation, and who must be periodically drenched with water. Here we have the formal rite, practically the same in each case. But what of the "myth"? For

---

10 *G. B.*, I., p. 272-278; *apud* Garnett, Lucy M. J., *The Women of Turkey and their Folklore: the Christian Women*, pp. 123 ff.

11 *supra* p. 58.

convenience of comparison let us set them down side by side, in parallel columns, thus:

	Perperia, all fresh bedewed, Freshen all the Neighborhood;
We go through the village; The clouds go through the sky;	By the woods, on the highway, As thou goest,— to God now pray: O my God,— upon the plain,
We go faster. Faster go the clouds; They have overtaken us, And wetted the corn and the vine.	Send thou us a still, small rain; That the fields may fruitful be, And vines in blossom we may see; That the grain be full and sound, And wealthy grow the folks around.

Though there is nothing like a strict parallelism, the original intention is identical. While, however, in the first instance the myth simply sets forth the action of the performers, and its symbolism, which, by anticipation, is treated as already fulfilled, in the latter case there is a distinct invocation of some power, originally represented by the maiden called Perperia. By the simple insertion of a reference to God, this invocation has been directed to Him, though it is noticeable that even in the present form the request is addressed *directly* to Perperia, and only through her to God. Thus by slow stages, the *modus operandi* has been transformed from the use of a rite which should produce the desired effect by sheer compulsion exerted directly on the clouds themselves, *through* the use of a rite, practically identical in its mimetic action (though the visiting of wells and springs is to be noticed as an addition)[12] but intended

[12] The spirits of springs were among the first to be invoked. Horace's fount of Bandusia (*Odes*, iii. 13) is the most famous in literature.) *cf.* Glover, *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, (Lond., 1909), p. 13 ff.; Warde Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 240. Tertullian speaks of the spirits of streams and wells in *De Bap.* 5.

now to influence some spirit or divinity impersonated by Perperia, to its final form of a dramatic supplication addressed to God himself. The whole of this transaction has been brought about by the variation in the "myth" which accompanies the action, and does not show in any element of the action itself.

A still more radical transformation has taken place in the following example, where the "myth" seems to have been entirely separated from its original rite, and to have become attached to another ceremony with which it had no genetic relation. But as details of the ritual action are wanting, it may be that some trace of their identity of origin remains.

"It is worth noting that an invocation of dew for the fertilization of man and plants and cattle forms part of an Epiphany δρώμενον that goes on in the island of Imbros to-day. A sort of 'aetiological myth' is chanted, telling of the 'Baptism of Christ.' Our Lady goes down to the Jordan, takes water, washes, and then entreats S. John Baptist to baptize the Holy Child. St. John makes answer:

> **Let him wait till the morn**
> **That I may ascend into heaven,**
> **To send down dew upon earth,**
> **That the master and his lady may be bedewed,**
> **That the mothers and their children be bedewed,**
> **That the plains with the trees be bedewed,**
> **That the springs and the waters be bedewed,**
> **That the cattle may be tame,**
> **And the idols may fall down."** (13)

This is indeed a "confusion" of magic with religion, with what appears to have been an ancient rain-making myth, carried over into a Christian religious observance.

---

13 *Themis*, p. 174. Miss Harrison suggests an original connection with a "sky-god," and says: "We find ourselves in full magic, S. John the Baptist and the Baptism of life-giving dew—the New Birth. S. John must ascend, must become a 'sky-god' before he can descend."

Can we discover in these various examples any change in the attitude which they represent? I think that without doubt we can. They represent a very distinct change in the attributes of the "object," from something that can be coerced to something that must be persuaded, and therefore the meaning of the rite has changed from coercion to persuasion. Here then there appears a perfectly clear difference of attitude, and it seems to me to be this changed attitude which marks the difference between magic and religion. Magic seeks to coerce, religion to persuade. If there was a period during which man did not have any conception of "souls" or "spirits" or personal powers, which, because capricious, needed to be approached circumspectly in order to win their favor, then during that period there would be no room for a distinction between magic and religion. But with the emergence of this concept of powers which *may* be capricious, and behave adversely toward him, comes the need of *pleasing* them, of winning their favor and help, and this change of attitude on man's part marks the birth of religion.

This change was, no doubt, a slow transition, not a sudden transformation, for man can not change his habits in a day, and he is so made that he must *grow* into "the knowledge of the truth." In the strict sense of the word, religion—as we use the term today—does not appear till man has come to a belief in "spiritual" powers which control his destiny, and in its highest manifestation this reaches the belief in One Supreme God.

The fact that many students have been deceived by external similarity of rites, into thinking that the significance of them must be identical, in spite of evidence of a radical *difference* in attitude, which they either overlooked or ignored, has led to much confusion of thought. We have seen, for instance, in some of the rites which we have studied, conclusive evidence of the religious attitude, as just defined, though the whole of the rite had all the other external marks

of pure magic. For in Singalang Burong of the Dyaks,[14] in Daramulun of the coast Murring,[15] in Wollunqua the giant snake,[16] and in the Mura-mura of the Dieri[17] we have discovered characteristics which showed that the attitude of the performers in the sacred rite was one of propitiation, and therefore of worship, primitive and debased though it is.

All the evidence goes to show that the Australian aborigines represent a much lower and probably earlier type of cultural development than the North American Indians, and we should presume that for this reason the religion of the Indians would be the farther advanced. In many ways this is the case. Among most of the Indians, particularly the Algonkin[18] and the Siouan tribes,[19] there is a belief in a mystic power, which though itself impersonal, is the source of all life and power, and in the Algonkin form of the belief, *manitou* becomes so closely identified with what we know as personality that it might almost be called the "Unknown."[20] This "spirit" seems to hover between personality and impersonality, and never to come to its own. Yet it *is* in all things, and becomes the spirit of each. This is, perhaps a higher and more universalized conception than those which lie behind the mysterious "beings" of the Australians and Borneo natives, but nevertheless the "worship" addressed

---

[14] *supra*, p. 14.

[15] *supra*, p. 17.

[16] *supra*, p. 32.

[17] *supra*, p. 56.

[18] Jones, W., *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, XVIII. (1905), pp. 183 ff., "The Algonkin Manitou."

[19] Dorsey, J. O., *Bureau of Amer. Anthropol., Report*, XI. (1889-90) pp. 351 ff., "Study of Siouan Cults." Fletcher and La Flesche, *Bureau of Amer. Anthropol., Report*, XXVII. (1905-1906), p. 134 ff., "The Omaha Tribe."

[20] Hartland, E. S., *Ritual and Belief*, p. 37.

to some of its manifestations does not differ so materially from the rites we have already seen.

The "Sun Dance" is one of the most famous of the Indian religious rites, and has been studied by trained observers who have recorded its wealth of detail with painstaking minuteness.[21] It consists almost exclusively of symbolic ritual "dances" or posturing, accompanied constantly by the chanting of the "myth" which interprets the rite. The connection of the myth with the ritual in the Arapaho dance is difficult to discern, a fact which would argue for accretions of unrelated material, but in the Cheyenne dance the connection between the two "is much more striking and logical." [22] In their main features these two examples are much the same, however. Both are "offered" as the fulfillment of a vow, and both are intended to obtain some desired blessing, such as health, victory or abundant crops. The Cheyenne dance is not called a Sun-Dance by the Cheyenne themselves, but, significantly enough, it is known as "The Ceremony of Rebirth." Its origin has already been suggested in the reference to the myths of the Cheyenne,[23] and its purpose was thus stated by one of the priests: "The object of the ceremony is to make the whole world over again, and from the time the Lodge-maker makes his vow everything is supposed to begin to take on a new life. * * * At the time of the Lone-tipi, when the earth is first created, [24] it is just beginning to grow. As the ceremony progresses, this earth increases

[21] Especially Geo. A. Dorsey, curator of the Field Museum, and the Rev. J. O. Dorsey of the Bureau of American Ethnology, to whom we refer.

[22] Dorsey, G. A., *The Cheyenne*, (Field Museum Publications No. 99, Chicago, 1905.), p. 185.

[23] *supra*, p. 34.

[24] The reference is to one of the ceremonies within the single tipi which is erected in the center of the ground on which the ceremony is performed.

in size, and when the Lodge itself is erected we build a fire which represents the heat of the sun, and we place the Lodge to face the east that the heavenly bodies may pass over it and fertilize it." [25] Certainly nothing could appear to be more "magical" than this, and this impression is strengthened by Mr. Dorsey's own comment on the ceremony, for he says: "That a majority of Cheyennes of middle life, and even a very large number of the young men who have been educated in the reservation or non-reservation schools, still have faith in the power of the Sun Dance to continue the life and health of the tribe, there is no doubt." [26] But are we on this account to conclude that the Sun Dance of the Cheyenne is *not* an expression of religion? Before we decide on our answer to this question we should consider the similar ceremony of the Arapaho. Mr. Dorsey witnessed two performances of this sacred dance, to one of which, held in 1902 he was specially bidden. Of this particular ceremony he says:[27] "It is impossible to conceive of a tribe of Indians offering an eight-day ceremony with less friction and with a greater amount of religious fervor and happiness than was manifested throughout the ceremony of this year." This particular ceremony was "offered" as a result of a vow on the part of one of the Arapaho who had been suffering from some mental derangement, in the hope that it would restore him to perfect health. The sentiment with which it was offered can be judged from the vow itself:

> "For the general good of my tribe, that the people may increase, that there may be no more sickness, I vow to have performed for me the ceremony of

---

[25] *op. cit.*, p. 187.

[26] *ibid.* p. 182.

[27] Dorsey, G. A., *The Arapaho Sun Dance* (Field Museum Publications No. 75, vol. 4, Chicago, 1903), p. 4.

> the 'Offering's-Lodge.' I hope that you, Man-Above (Chebbeníathan), will meet my desires and wishes for my race and for my own benefit, for my tipi, my wife and children. I pray that whatsoever I may undertake to do hereafter I may accomplish it to my best interest!" [28]

However magical the Sun Dance may appear, we are forced, on the strength of such evidence as this to admit that it breathes the humble spirit of "prayer, for us the foremost criterion of true religion." [29]

Primitive religion is not to be distinguished from magic by the outward form of the rites which it employs, much less by the absence of such rites, on which its very life depends. But primitive religion, and all other religion for that matter, is clearly differentiated from all forms of pure magic by the sentiment of humility which inspires it, by the attitude of submission and obedience which it displays, in fact by that mysterious and significant thing which we call a "change of heart," or a "new life."

---

[28] *ibid.* p. 9.

[29] Marett, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

VI

THE EVOLUTION OF A RITE

All the habitual activities of the savage are associated with fixed rituals, such as those of hunting, fishing and making war. Most of these ceremonies are considered by anthropologists to be more or less "magical" in character, some of them are called religious. I have tried to show that fundamentally, and up to a certain point in their development, all such ceremonies are equally magical and equally religious; in fact that before the emergence of the idea of personal or "spiritual" beings to whom man owes homage and obedience, there is no room for the distinction between magic and religion, since they represent the same attitude. Even after the changed attitude of religion has begun to appear, and magic and religion have in so far become separated, they both continue to make use of ceremonial or ritual performances, the function of which is to bring about the desired result in such case. It is the peculiar character, usually called "magical," attached to these ceremonies that is believed to obtain the accomplishment of the purpose for which they are intended. I purposely avoid the use of the much simpler express "to cause the result" for it is not at all certain that the casual category is yet understood by the participants, in the strict sense in which we understand the word "cause."

I have attempted, moreover, to describe in a general way, the process by which it seems more than possible that the use of such ceremonies might have come about. I wish now to draw attention to the pecular character of the Rite, strictly so called, and to distinguish it from the more fundamental

and inclusive thing, the ceremony, which it develops. We have seen that the term "myth" is used in several senses with the result that its meaning is obscured, and in much the same way the term "rite" is used rather indiscriminately and generally confused with ceremony. The dictionaries do not afford us much assistance, usually treating rite as a synonym of ceremony and referring from one to the other in the tantalizing way of dictionaries, but they afford a hint of what seems to be a real distinction. Ceremony is referred to the Sanskrit KAR, to do, while rite is referred to the Sanskrit RI, to flow. There may be numerous ways of doing a thing, as we have already suggested, and out of these, several may receive the necessary sanction to dignify them as ceremonials, but there can be but *one* rite. Ceremony is inclusive and conjunctive, rite is exclusive and distinctive; the ceremony is for all, the rite for the few. Both rest on custom and tradition, and both require coöperation and consent, but the rite possesses a peculiar sanctity and calls for an explicit faith in its efficacy. I have laid down this distinction rather dogmatically, for the sake of contrast, but hope to be able to show the necessity for insisting on the distinction and sufficient evidence of its reality and value.

It is now pretty generally agreed that primitive man was not guided very largely by reason and logic, but by instinct and impulse. It is probably justifiable to assume, contrary to the intellectual hypothesis, that he was most likely to act first, and to think—if he thought about it at all—afterwards.[1] And so the explanation of the use of any

[1] "I care not what goes on in his so-called mind; the important thing is that, given the stimulation, it must produce response, or else modify responses which have been already initiated. This is the all-important thing, and I will be content with it." (Watson, *op cit.*, p. 17). "Now doubtless a considerable amount of real inference may be operative at certain stages in the development of magic. Nay, various forms of magic may even be found to have originated in a theorizing about causes that did not

ceremonies should naturally come subsequently to their habitual use. For a long time, even, there would probably not be any reason given for their use, since there would not be any one to ask for such. Like Topsy, they "jest growed." Do you ever stop to ask why you drive on the right side of the road? A fairly good illustration of our own tenacity of custom is furnished by the fact that automobiles, in this country, were first made with a "righthand drive" for no other reason than that we have always driven horses with the "box seat" on the right. I surmise that it was not the manifest advantage of driving on the left where the "rule of the road" is to pass to the right, but the search for novelty, which prompted the first introduction of the "left-hand drive" on motor cars. Here was a distinct change of the *mores* but the public "stood for it" and it is coming to be universal. But what about the coachmen? They still continue in the old way. We drive to the right and we now—in automobiles at least—sit on the left, and no one asks *why!* Perhaps there was a good reason once, no doubt some antiquarian will be able to tell it to us even now, but we reck not of it. In this very homely illustration we have all the elements which develop a rite out of a ceremony.

Group solidarity is one of the prevailing characteristics of the lower forms of society. It is hardly justifiable to speak of "individuals" in such a society for there are none; they are simply members of the group. I suppose that it is here that primitive communality differs from modern democracy. Though a group must be composed of integral parts, in savage society the exigences of maintaining a pre-

---

arise out of practice save indirectly, and was the immediate fruit of reflection. * * * But, speaking generally, the working principle we had better adopt as inquirers into the origin of magic is, I suggest, the following: to expect theory to grow out of practice, rather than the other way about * * *." (Marett, *op. cit.*, p. 36-39).

carious existence constitute the group out of its members, and their very survival depends largely on its continuance. A democracy, on the contrary, is constituted by the individuals themselves, and its continuance depends on their will. Whether the government be vested in headmen, or a council of chiefs, or in a single ruler, it is essentially the same for there is but one mind in the group as a whole. If any change in the customery procedure takes place, in fact before it *can* take place, it must receive the assent of the group. If any one asserts his leadership, it is because of his ability to personify the group and express or create its opinion. In this way the possibility of some measure of change is left open. Speaking of the influence of the "Alatunja" or head man among the Arunta, Spencer and Gillen say:[2]

"As among all savage tribes the Australian native is bound hand and foot by custom. What his fathers did before him that he must do. If during the performance of a ceremony his ancestors painted a white line across the forehead, that line he must paint. Any infringement of custom, within certain limitations, is visited with sure and often severe punishment. At the same time, rigidly conservative as the native is, it is yet possible for changes to be introduced. Every now and then a man arises of superior ability to his fellows. When large numbers of the tribe are gathered together—at least it was so on the special occasion to which we alude—one or two of the older men are at once seen to wield a special influence over the others. Everything, as we have before said, does not depend upon age. At this gathering, for example, some of the oldest men were of no account; but, on the other hand, others not so old as they were, but more learned in ancient lore or more skilled in matters of magic, were looked up to by the others, and they

[2] *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 11.

it was who settled everything. It must, however, be understood that we have no definite proof to bring forward of the actual introduction by this means of any fundamental change of custom. The only thing that we can say is that, after carefully watching the natives during the performance of their ceremonies and endeavoring as best we could to enter into their feelings, to think as they did, and to become for the time being one of themselves, we came to the conclusion that if one or two of the most powerful men settled upon the advisability of introducing some change, even an important one, it would be quite possible for this to be agreed upon and carried out. That changes have been introduced, in fact, are still being introduced, is a matter of certainty; the difficulty to be explained is, how in the face of the rigid conservatism of the native, which may be said to be one of his leading features, such changes can possibly even be mooted."

Theologians are fond of pointing out that faith implies doubt, that only where there is some element of uncertainty, some possibility of being mistaken, can faith find any place, and it is also common to distinguish between *fides implicita* and *fides explicita*. It is very much this difference which distinguishes the rite from the ceremony, if our interpretation be correct.

So long as there is no question of the necessity for the use of the ceremony, or any doubt as to its value or efficacy, no particular explanation or justifictaion of it will appear; it will not have any doctrinal content. We have pointed out how the myth, properly so called, is associated with the rites, and there is every reason to suppose that the same is true of the ceremony in its earliest form, at which time the vocal accompaniment is one element of the ceremony itself. But we have insisted that there is no doctrinal significance in the myth at this stage. It is when the efficacy of the cere-

mony to produce any effect comes into question, or when its effect ceases to be immediately felt and has to be justified, when in fact it ceases to be an immediate content of experience, that the aetiological myth attaches itself to the acts of the ceremony, and it becomes partially symbolical. Another way of saying the same thing is that the meaning of the ceremony becomes obscured. It has become so much of a convention that it has lost much of the spontaneity which originally characterized it.[3] Such a change would not come about suddenly, and could not be discovered, in all probability, except by comparison after the lapse of a considerable time, often generations. It is during this time that the separation of the myth from the ritual, and the transformation of it into legend, or the substitution for the original ceremonial myth of an aetiological myth or a formal doctrine takes place. A good illustration is to be found in the Book of Exodus:[4]

> "And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of Jehovah's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses."

There are various reasons why such a transformation should take place. The gradual expansion of the primary group and the dispersion of its members to such an extent that their original solidarity becomes less evident is probably one of the most common. Evidently this has already taken

[3] Ritual acts are acts out of the ordinary course—often clean out of the ordinary course. Therein consits their essence, their virtue. But in the growth of civilization, with the emergence of a new religion of different customs, the real meaning of a traditional rite is obscured, the rite itself becomes decadent, and a new meaning is assigned to it." (Hartland, *op. cit.*, p. 234.)

[4] Exodus, 12:26-27.

place among the Australian natives and one of the most important of the objects of their totem ceremonies, or rites, for they have come to be the exclusive rites of particular totem groups, is to emphasize their common origin. An interesting demonstration of this power of the rite to hold the group together is given by Howitt.[5]

"During this time the pressure of our civilization had broken down the tribal organization; the white man's vices, which the Kurnai had acquired, had killed off a great number, the remainder had mostly been gathered into mission-stations, and only a few still wandered over their ancestral hunting grounds, leading their old lives in some measure, and having apparently abandoned their ancestral customs. When, however, it was decided that the Jerail ceremony[6] should be revived for the instruction of their young men, I observed with much interest, that the old tribal organization arose again, so to say, out of the dust, and became active."[7]

Levy-Bruhl has suggested, with considerable detail, how the use of magical rites becomes more imperative as the consciousness of an original "participation" in a common life loses its vividness, and that at the same time the intellectual element in them becomes more and more prominent. At an earlier period, before the primary group has begun to break

[5] *op. cit.*, p. 317.

[6] i. e. initiation; *cf.* the Murring term *Kuringal.*

[7] Referring to these changes in Australia, Hartland says: "The least archaic types" (i. e. of the social organization) "exhibit the old social organization breaking down and new structures in course of formation. With the evolution of society an evolution of belief has been going on. It has not been exactly concurrent. Culture rarely or never evolves equally in all directions. It is a mental process, partly conscious, partly unconscious. The collective mind of a given society, like the individual minds of which it is composed, is not exercised equally on all subjects at the same time." (*op. cit.* pp. 97-98.)

up, there is, he says, an unshaken faith in the power of certain ceremonies to produce the most extraordinary effects, which no amount of sensible evidence to the contrary can in any way weaken. This is an illustration of "implicit faith," and it differs from the kind of faith which now appears, if we accept the account which Levy-Bruhl proposes. He goes on to say: "But when perception becomes less mystic, when these fixed connections no longer possess the same sovereign control, nature and the environment are looked upon with less of prepossession, and these 'collective representations' (ceremonies) commence to reflect the effects of experience." It is at this stage, when the influence of actual experience is making itself felt, that the significance of "contradiction" begins to be appreciated, and logical difficulties begin to appear. Then it is that the emphasis begins to be put upon the *representation* of mystic connections, by all sorts of means familiar to us as "magical," since "the community of essence and of life, which formerly had been *felt* in a fashion truly immediate, was now in danger of appearing unintelligible, from the moment that it ceased to be vivid." [8]

Another powerful influence which leads to the modification of ritual practices is the infiltration of new ceremonies from alien sources. Spencer and Gillen suggest such a transmission from tribe to tribe [9] and Boas gives illustrations of inconsistencies in the mythologies of various Indian tribes which evidently have come about through diffusion.[10] But this opens up the subject of *meum et teum* and the primitive concept of the sacred and profane, which we must consider.

---

[8] Les *Fonctions Mentales dans les Sociétés Inferieures.* (Paris 1910), pp. 442 ff.

[9] *op. cit.*, p. 14.

[10] "The Growth of Indian Mythologies," in *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, IX. pp. 1-11, *cf. supra* p. 35.

Suffice it to say of the Rite that it is the sacred possession of one group, to the exclusion of others, and that it has a very definite intellectual content. It is a symbol of participation in a common life, or represents a definite and inviolable relationship between personal beings, and it is the recognized and effective means of preserving and promoting this common bond.

Absolute faith in the efficacy of the rite is essential, and is tacitly admitted by the very participation in it, but is usually more or less explicit in the rite itself. But the power of the rite is never *absolute*. It is contingent. In the purely magical rite it is contingent upon the absence of any other rite with a preponderating control of the mystic forces in the universe, and in the religious rite it is contingent upon the common consent of both parties to the transaction.

In all of this the necessity of belief, and the more explicit and open avowal of that belief, with the doctrinal element which it necessitates, is plainly evident, but the origin of the rite must be traced to the larger and more inclusive group of ceremonies out of which it grows. It rests primarily on tradition and social sanction, and only secondarily, and in so far as its individual application may sanction, upon experience.

VII

THE FUNCTION OF THE RITE: I.

THERE are few things that are unaccompanied by the use of some formal rite, in primitive society, but there are certain spheres of primitive life in which the rite is everything, and without its use all social life would come to a sudden end. The relation of ceremonial to primitive government was elaborately set forth by Herbert Spencer [1] who said "the modified forms of action caused in men by the presence of their fellows, constitutes that comparatively vague control out of which other more definite controls are evolved—the primitive, undifferentiated kind of government from which political and religious governments are differentiated, and in which they ever continue immersed." [2] But there are many striking instances in which the control is anything but "vague," and to some of these we will now turn our attention in order to discover some of the more important uses of the rite.

First among these, both in point of time and in measure of importance is the rite of initiation. We have already described some of its elements, as they appear in the forms used by the Australian tribes, and now wish to look at these initiatory rites and others like them, paying particular attention to their significance. It is a truism to say that the rite is a *social* transaction, but it is necessary for us to keep the fact in mind since its primary function is to create, to represent and to reinforce the social bonds which hold indi-

[1] *Principles of Sociology*, (New York, 1900), II. pp. 1-230, "Ceremonial Institutions."

[2] *ibid.* p. 6.

viduals together in a social whole. The first of these rites is that by which the youth is initiated into the tribal life. Such ceremonies are sometimes called "puberty rites," [3] though in some cases, as with the Arunta, they spread over a series of years, and in most cases there are subordinate but kindred rites at birth. In all of these rites there is an elaborate sequence of ceremonies the general significance of which is the rebirth of the novice in the character of a full-fledged member of the social group.[4]

In many of the ceremonies there is a dramatic representation of the surrender of the youth on the part of his mother, or of the women of the tribe, with whom up to this time he has been exclusively associated, and with whom, from now on, he will have practically nothing to do. "Among the Yaroinga tribe of Queensland, when initiation draws nigh, the novice, who has been elaborately decorated with waist-belt and head-dress, is brought before his parents and friends. 'When the women first gaze upon the lad thus ornamented, they all begin to cry, and so do his intimate relatives, his father and mother's brothers, who further smear themselves over with grease and ashes to express their grief.'" [5] An interesting confirmation of the fact that the separation of the child from the women and his incorporation into the male portion of the tribe, regardless of his age, and subject *only* to the performance of the proper rite, comes from New Caledonia, where circumcision has been advanced from the usual age at which puberty occurs, to the age of three years, the puberty rite, strictly speaking, having become obsolete. In this case, a boy remains with his mother until he is weaned,

[3] *e. g.*, Webster, H., *Primitive Secret Societies*, chap. 2: "The Puberty Institution." (New York, 1908)

[4] This sequence of ceremonies, and its significance, is elaborately worked out by Arnold van Gennep in *Les Rites de Passage*, (Paris, 1909), to which we shall have occasion to refer.

[5] Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

which is followed by circumcision, and the conferring upon the infantile tribesman of the *marrou,* or emblem of manhood, and subsequent to which he "no longer has anything to do with his mother, and sees in her nothing more than an ordinary woman." [6] Regardless of age, regardless of native abilities, a man can not become a *man* in the social sense without the use of the prescribed rite *which makes him a man.* The familiar Scotch saying "a man's a man for a' that" would never apply to primitive society. In the initiation ceremony among the Coast Murring which we have already quoted at some length from Mr. Howitt's description,[7] there was a good example of the strictness of this requirement. "There were at this time two or three Biduelli men with their wives and children in the encampment, and also one of the Krauatungalung Kurnai, with his wife and child. When these ceremonies commenced, they, with one exception, went away, because neither the Biduelli nor the Krauatun Kurnai had, as I have said before, been 'made men.' The one man who remained was the old patriarch of the Biduelli, and he was now driven crouching among the women and children. The reason was self-evident; he had never been made a man, and therefore was no more than a mere boy." [8] Recalling the humiliating position in which this old patriarch was left, huddled among the women and covered over with skins and blankets, all for the lack of a proceeding which seems to us both meaningless and futile,

---

[6] *ibid,* p. 23. This instance throws an interesting side light on the little understood variation in the administration of the Rite of Confirmation in the Greek Orthodox and Anglican Churches. The Apostolic rite, which was originally associated with Baptism, is kept in this relation by its administration to infants in the Greek Church, while the Anglican use has postponed it till about the age of puberty.

[7] *supra,* p. 16.

[8] Howitt, *op. cit.,* p. 530.

we get some idea of what initiation really is. In some cases where the privilege of initiation has not been availed of for some good reason, such as battle, famine, epidemic or some other cause that has prevented either the holding of the rites or participation therein on the part of certain individuals, the lack may subsequently be supplied, and mature men, bearded and the fathers of families, take their place side by side with the youths, in order to come into the fulness of their social heritage. [9]

The bond of brotherhood, strong enough, as in the example already mentioned, to make a man give his life for his "brother" rests not on the possession of one mother, but in having participated in the common life of the tribe. Webster says: "It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of these ceremonies as providing social bonds based upon ideas of kinship and brotherhood in societies without a centralized political control, and as promoting a very real sense of solidarity in a tribal organization consisting only of initiated men." [10]

The commonist and most significant element of the rite of initiation is some form of mimetic representation of the death and resurrection of the novice.[11] Examples of the various forms which this representation assumes are almost without number and they are to be found in all grades of culture from the lowest to the highest, and from the loose coördination of society such as it found among the Australian tribes to the form of government by tribal chiefs, as among the American Indians. As Herbert Spencer suggested, social control solely by means of ceremonial gradually gives place

[9] Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 25 ff.

[10] *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[11] cf. Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 38 ff. For a discussion of the significance of these ceremonies *vide* Frazer, *G. B.*, 3rd. ed., XI., pp. 225-278, where it is related to totemism; and Miss Harrison's *Themis, passim* from which I quote at some length below.

to political centralization, but not all the functions of social control pass to the chieftains, and we find the growth of secret societies, which spring up on the basis of the earlier initiatory rites, which are thus preserved. This is one evidence of the formal representation of the "participation" of the members of the group in a common life, to which we have already referred.[12] Though it represents a development beyond the most primitive form of the initiation rite, I select an example from one of these societies in Ceram, an island of the Dutch East Indies, because of the interest which attaches to the significant details of the rite. The society is known as the Kakian association, and its chief object is the initiation of the young men.[13]

"The Kakian house is an oblong wooden shed, situated under the darkest trees in the depth of the forest, and is built to admit so little light that it is impossible to see what goes on in it. Every village has such a house. Thither the boys who are to be initiated are conducted blindfolded, followed by their parents and relations. Each boy is led by the hand by two men, who act as his sponsors or guardians, looking after him during the period of initiation. When all are assembled before the shed, the high priest calls aloud upon the devils. Immediately a hideous uproar is heard to proceed from the shed. It is made by men with bamboo trumpets, who have been secretly introduced into the building by a back door, but the women and children think it is made by the devils, and are much terrified. Then the priest enters the shed, followed by the boys, one at a time. As soon as each boy has disappeared within the precincts, a dull chopping sound is heard, a fearful cry rings out, and a sword or spear, dripping with blood, is thrust through the

[12] *supra* p. 85. On the development of these secret societies *cf.* Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, chap. 6 ff., *cf. etiam infra* p. 141, n. 51.

[13] *G. B.*, 3d. ed., XI., p. 249 ff.

roof of the shed. This is a token that the boy's head has been cut off, and that the devil has carried him away to the other world, to regenerate and transform him. So at sight of the bloody sword the mothers weep and wail, crying that the devil has murdered their children. In some places, it would seem, the boys are pushed through an opening made in the shape of a crocodile's jaws or a cassowary's beak, and it is then said that the devil has swallowed them. The boys remain in the shed for five or nine days. Sitting in the dark, they hear the blast of the bamboo trumpets, and from time to time the sound of musket shots and the clash of swords. Every day they bathe, and their faces and bodies are smeared with a yellow dye, to give them the appearance of having been swallowed by the devil. During his stay in the Kakian house each boy has one or two crosses tatooed with thorns on his breast or arm. When they are not sleeping, the lads must sit in a crouching posture without moving a muscle. As they sit in a row cross-legged, with their hands stretched out, the chief takes his trumpet, and placing the mouth of it on the hands of each lad, speaks through it in strange tones, imitating the voice of the spirits. He warns the lads, under pain of death, to observe the rules of the Kakian society, and never to reveal what has passed in the Kakian house. The novices are also told by the priests to behave well to their blood relations, and are taught the traditions and secrets of the tribe.

Meantime the mothers and sisters of the lads have gone home to weep and mourn. But in a day or two the men who acted as guardians or sponsors to the novices return to the village with the glad tidings that the devil, at the intercession of the priests, has restored the lads to life. The men who bring this news come in a fainting state and daubed with mud, like messengers freshly arrived from the nether world. Before leaving the Kakian house, each lad receives from the priest a stick adorned at both ends with rock's or cassowary's

feathers. The sticks are supposed to have been given to the lads by the devil at the time when he restored them to life, and they serve as a token that the youths have been in the spirit land. When they return to their homes they totter in their walk, and enter the house backward, as if they had forgotten how to walk properly; or they enter the house by the back door. If a plate of food is given them they hold it upside down. They remain dumb, indicating their wants by signs only. All this is to show that they are still under the influence of the devil or the spirits. Their sponsors have to teach them all the common acts of life, as if they were new-born children * * * After these initiatory rites the lads are deemed men, and may marry; it would be a scandal if they married before." [14]

Miss Harrison has analyzed the initiation rite and finds its essential features to be three:

1. A contest, or *Agôn,* between two opponents.

2. A ritual death, or defeat of one of the contestants. This is called the *Pathos;* it is generally announced by a *Messenger,* and followed by the *Threnos,* lamentation and mourning.

3. A triumphant reappearance or resurrection, and *Epiphany.* This appearance is naturally accompanied by the *Peripeteia,* or sudden transition from mourning to joy.[15]

There may be the omission or abbreviation of some element, but they are all strikingly present in the instance we have quoted.

---

[14] Though Dr. Frazer uses the word "devil" throughout, there is nothing to indicate that the supernatural being believed to kill and resuscitate the novices has any of the *malignant* characteristics which the name would suggest.

[15] *Themis,* pp. 331 ff., 342 ff. *et. al.*

Miss Harrison has traced the growth of the gods of Olympus, and subsequently of the Mystery of Dionysos—which is characteristic of *all* the Greek Mysteries—from this earliest rite of initiation. Our immediate interest in this theory lies in the fact that it rests on the assumption that both social solidarity, the feeling of oneness which binds the members of the social group together, and subsequently religious communion with the deity of the group are *dependent on the rite.* The particular application of the theory of the social basis of religion, which Miss Harrison makes in *Themis,* to account for the origin of the Hymn of the Kouretes,[16] may be generalized and applied to the whole question of the function of the rite. We may borrow Miss Harrison's words and apply them to our own problem. She says: "The worshippers in the Hymn invoke a Kouros who is obviously but a reflection or impersonation of the body of Kouretes. They 'allege as their reason' an aetiological myth. This myth on examination turns out to be but the mythical representation of a rite of mimic death and resurrection practiced at a ceremony of initiation. Now the Kouros and the Kourtees are figures that belong to *cultus;* they are what would in common parlance be called religious. We are face to face with the fact, startling enough, that these religious figures arise, not from any 'religious instinct,' not from any innate tendency to prayer and praise *but straight out of a social custom.* Themis and Dike, invoked by the Kouretes, lie at the undifferentiated beginnings of things when social spelt religious. They are not late abstractions, but primitive realities and sanctities.

"This contradicts, it is clear, many preconceived notions. We are accustomed to regard religion as a matter intensely spiritual and individual. Such undoubtedly it tends to be-

[16] Discovered in the Temple of the Diktaean Zeus as Palaikastro, in Crete. cf. British School of Athens, *Annual,* XI. 299; XV. *passim.*

come, but in its origin, in the case under investigation it is not spiritual and individual, but social and collective. But for the existence of a tribe or group of some kind, a ceremony of initiation would be impossible. The surprise is all the greater because the particular doctrine in question, that of the New Birth, is usually held to be late and due to 'Orphic,' *i. e.* quasi Oriental influence. It is held to have affinities with Christianity, and is a doctrine passionately adhered to by many sects and establishments in the present day. It may indeed—in some form or other—as Conversion or as Regeneration—be said to be the religious doctrine par excellence." [17]

The first important function of the rite is this expression of a sort of mystic oneness, the binding of a larger or smaller aggregation of individuals into a homogenous whole actuated by one spirit. This feeling of oneness is inseparable from emotion, and emotion felt collectively is emotion heightened and reinforced and rendered permanent. This it is which the rite accomplishes.[18]

The attention of primitive man centered naturally on the unusual and the mysterious. There is a sense in which the unusual is always mysterious, just because it is pregnant with possibilities which experience cannot anticipate. But there is another sense in which certain great events of life, though not unknown or peculiar, are nevertheless what we call occasional, and for the very reason that some of their possibilities *are* already known, they are more heavily laden with mystery than if wholly unique.[19] Of this character

[17] *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.

[18] "Intellectually the group is weak; every one knows this who has ever sat on a committee and arrived at a confused compromise. Emotionally the group is strong; every one knows this who has felt the thrill of speaking to or acting with a great multitude." (*ibid.* p. 43).

[19] "Given the imagination, the sense of mystery and withal so much self-consciousness as is required to make the idea of soul,

are birth and death, adolescence and marriage, famine and pestilence, seed-time and harvest, lightning and tempest and other crises of various sorts. The primary instincts of the propagation and preservation of life must have been, to the savage, the centers of great emotional tension, the source of great anxiety and of great joy, and round these the earliest social restrictions would be bound to gather. These, then, became the nodal points round which centered the earliest prohibitions or *taboos,* and from which developed the first germs of religion.[20]

The difficult questions related to *taboo* and evil spirits are too numerous and the field which they open up is too vast for us to attempt any discussion of them here. But the problems do not affect our main thesis, for no matter how the points in dispute between the authorities on these subjects may be decided, it has never been questioned that on whatever hypothesis their *origin* may be explained, the mechanism for dealing with them both has always been some form of rite!

We have already indicated our conviction that so far as

---

or double, or shadowy spiritual counterpart; and these crises of social experience become clothed with a significance not limited to this visible context: the unseen world becomes peopled with spirits, and in time with gods." (Hocking, W. E., *The Meaning of God in Human Experience,* New Haven, 1912, p. 231).

[20] *cf.* The Litany in the Anglican Prayer Book, the oldest formula, in its present wording, in the Anglican Church, in which this element is plainly discernible:

"From lightning and tempest; from plague, pestilence, and famine; from battle and murder and from sudden death,
Good Lord deliver us.

* * *

"That it may please thee to preserve all who travel by land or by water, all women in the perils of child-birth, all sick persons, and young children; and to show thy pity upon all prisoners and captives;
We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord."

the *external* character of the rite is concerned, its form or mechanism, as it were, may be the same in both magic and religion. There are many subsidiary rites, performed for certain specific purposes, which may, from another point of view, be considered as both magic and religious, or either, as the case may be. For this reason no satisfactory classification of rites is possible. According as one views them they may be divided into various groups or classes, but none of these is strictly exact, some rites falling in more than one group because they have more than one object, and by a slight change in the *theory* or basis of classification, the whole scheme is immediately put awry. Numerous attempts have been made to draw up a comprehensive scheme which would include all rites, of whatever sort, viewing them either from the *way, ex hypothesi,* in which they work, such as by sympathetic magic or contagious magic;[21] or direct and indirect, positive and negative;[22] or they may be viewed according to the *effects* they produce, and classified as communal or personal;[23] as giving protection or defense, as signifying propitiation or consecration, as producing fruitfulness or purification and so on.[24]

In the midst of such apparent confusion we are making the endeavor to cling to the *attitude* indicated by the rite, in the hope that this may be the slender thread which will enable us to tread this difficult maze. We have spoken of the attitude of social oneness as being perhaps the first and most important significance of the rite, and we wish now to pass to the consideration of the rite as a means of purification, but before doing so it is necessary to say a word of the

[21] Frazer, *G. B.*, vols. I & II. "The Magic Art." *cf.* also van Gennep, *Rites de Passage.*

[22] van Gennep, A., *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[23] Brinton, D. G., *Religions of Prim. Peoples,* (N. Y. 1897).

[24] van Gennep, *op cit.*, p. 15; *cf.* for *taboo,* Sumner, W. G. *Folkways,* (Boston, 1913), p. 30-31.

attitudes—for there are two, at least—which such a use of the rite may represent.

Taboo occupies a very large part of the attention of primitive man, and its purpose is to avoid danger of various sorts. In it is to be found the primordial germ of moral law, but it is not merely *inhibition,* it was more than "thou shalt not." It has in it an element of positiveness in that it is "destined to protect the principle of life in the individual, in the group or in the whole of nature." [25] As van Gennep well points out, the *taboo* represents an active nolition, and not merely a suspended act of volition, and it exists only as the counterpart of certain positive rites. This distinction is of the greatest importance, if true, it seems to me, since *psychologically* it would be made up of the same elements as any positive act of will, which assumes the inhibition of all conflicting impulses, and would not be comparable, in its emotional or physiological concomitants, to inhibition *sui generis.*[26] These restrictions may be of two sorts; they may simply be preventative, intended to ward off and protect from any possible causes of harm; or they may be "destructive" in the sense of a more positive and active repression or destruction of such causes. Amulets, charms and acts of propitiation would partake of the protective character, while exorcism, confession and some forms of sacrifice would be of the other type, if we apply the distinction beyond the realm of *taboo,* strictly interpreted. As an example of a simple *taboo* of both kinds, the restrictions laid upon women, as a possible source of evil influence, would be of one kind, while the

[25] Dussaud, R., *Introduction a l'histoire des religions,* (Paris, 1914), p. 259.

[26] "Psychologiquement, il repond à la *nolonté,* comme le rite positif à la volonté, c'est-a-dire qu'il traduit bien lui aussi une manière de vouloir, et qu'il est une acte, mais non la négation d'une acte." *op. cit.,* p. 10. The author says that Jevons, Crawley and Salamon-Reinach have made a mistake in overlooking this mutual interdependence.

restrictions placed on marriage, to prevent what would be considered incest, would be of the other.

Now all of these things have to do with the avoiding of or removal of evil or impurity or some sort of contamination which, at first at least, was conceived of as "substantial." As long as the source of the evil remains *outside* of the individual or the group that fears it, so that it is conceived of in purely objective terms, we may possibly be in the realm of "animism" and a belief in good and evil spirits, but we have not yet come to the dawn of religion. When, however, the evil gets *inside* the individual or has found lodgment within the group, though we may still have a substantial and wholly objective view of the evil, in which case the rites of purification will remain purely unmoral, yet we are on the verge of the transition to the *subjective* view of evil which marks the dawn of religion, in the higher sense of the word. Here then we have the key to the interpretation of all rites of purification. In any case there is fear which has to be removed, but by the character of this fear we may discover the character of the object which provokes it. It may be the fear of an individual for some unknown evil power that lurketh in secret places, or the fear of evil magic or of pestilence on the part of the whole group, which prompts the use of a rite of purification, but such use will not be religious.

" 'The feare of things invisible is the naturall seed of Religion,' said Hobbes, and he spoke truly, but his statement requires some modification or rather amplification. It is not the fear of the individual savage that begets religion, it is the fear felt together, fear emphasized, qualified by a sort of social sanction. Moreover, fear does not quite express the emotion felt. It is rather awe, and awe contains in it the element of wonder as well as fear; awe is on the way

to be reverence, and reverence is essentially religious." [27] It is when the group makes some effort to undo an evil in the causing of which the group as a whole, or some member of it, has had a share, or when an individual seeks to rid himself of a burden on his soul which is other than mere fear, that we come to a rite of purification in the true sense of a religious rite.

[27] *Themis*, p. 64. *cf.* "Mystic fear, then, is a fear charged with an overtone of wonder." (Marett, *op. cit.*, p. 157.)

VIII

THE FUNCTION OF THE RITE: II.

THE transition from the idea of evil as a substantial thing like a vapor or miasma, to evil as a matter of thought and life, and the accompanying transition from the conception of impurity as a ritual disqualification, to the concept of impurity as an immoral quality, has required nearly the whole era of man's history. It marks the evolution of religious thought, and its probable course, as suggested by Dr. Farnell, has been associated with the progress in the rites of purification itself.[1] Ideas of impurity have always centered round *blood,* itself the "sign" of life and the primeval source of defilement, and the midway stage in the evolution is probably represented by such ritual requirements as those which forbade the North American Indian mourners to recount tales of fighting or to use "bad words" during the period of ritual seclusion which was a part of their mourning, and therefore of a purificatory rite, and that other *taboo* which prohibited the laying of a "suppliant-bough" on the altar of the Eleusinion at Athens, during the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries.[2] In both of these the connection seems to be through the association of discord, quarreling and vindictive speech with blood-shed and death.

During the earlier stages of religion the impurity or "sin," in its unethical sense, was contagious, as it were, and could therefore be transformed to some material thing and thus removed. Perhaps the commonest and most wide-

[1] Farnell, L. R. *The Evolution of Religion,* (N. Y. 1905), pp. 88-162, Lecture iii. "The Ritual of Purification."

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 113-114.

spread method of such purification was by means of lustration, and about this form of rite nothing need here be said. Another very common rite was one usually known as the "scapegoat" from its familiar title in our Bible, and its importance in the Jewish ritual of the Day of Atonement.[3] A ceremony of this kind, though very unlike the Biblical example, is reported as being held every year among the Garos of Assam.[4] "The animal chosen has a rope fastened round its neck and is led by two men, one on each side of it, to every house in the village. It is taken inside each house in turn, the assembled villagers, meanwhile, beating the walls from the outside, to frighten and drive out any evil spirits which may have taken up their residence within. The round of the village having been made in this manner, the monkey or rat is led to the outskirts of the village, killed by a blow of a *dao,* which disembowels it, and then crucified on bamboos set up in the ground. Round the crucified animal long, sharp bamboo stakes are placed, which form *chevaux de frise* round about it. * * * Here the crucified ape or rat is the public scapegoat, which by its vicarious sufferings and death relieves the people from all sickness or mishap in the coming year." Here there is no suggestion of anything resembling moral evil or sin, and the rite is probably purely magical, and intended to banish "devils." Examples of human scape-goats, from many parts of the world, are well authenticated, some of whom were brutally killed, some of them made to suffer only indignities and pain and later permitted surreptitiously to return from their banishment.[5] But

---

[3] Leviticus 16.

[4] *G. B.*, 3d. ed. IX., p. 208.

[5] A very interesting survival of what was probably a human scapegoat sacrifice in its origin, and was transformed from a heathen to a Christian ceremony is described at length by Frazer in *G. B.* II., p. 164 ff., "St. Romain and the Dragon of Rouen." For other examples *cf. G. B.* IX. p. 210-274.

even in these, the highest type of purification is not necessarily reached, as is amply demonstrated by the numerous human sacrifices of the ancient Aztecs.[6] As we have often repeated, we are likely to be deceived by the outward appearance of the rite, for purely magical ideas find expression under ritual acts which *appear* highly ethical, while highly religious and ethical attitudes are sometimes expressed in an outward rite which seems purely magical, as in the following instance.[7]

"The Aurohuaca Indians, who under the tropical sun of South America, inhabit a chilly region bordering on the perpetual snows of the Sierra Nevada in Columbia, believe that all sickness is a punishment for sin. So when one of their medicine-men is summoned to a sick bed, he does not enquire after the patient's symptoms but makes strange passes over him and asks in a sepulchral voice whether he will confess his sins. If the sick man persists in drawing a veil of silence over his frailties, the doctor will not attempt to treat him, but will turn on his heel and leave the house. On the other hand if a satisfactory confession has been made, the leach directs the patient's friends to procure certain odd-looking bits of stone or shell to which the sins of the sufferer may be transferred, for when that is done he will be made whole. For this purpose the sin-laden stones or shells are carried high up into the mountains and laid in some spot where the first beams of the sun,[8] rising in clear or clouded majesty above the long white slopes or the towering crags of

---

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 275-305.

[7] *op. cit.* III., pp. 215-216. Frazer classes this as magic!

[8] Water, fire and sunlight are the great purifiers, fire and the sun most prominently in Parseeism or the system of Zoroaster. "So curiously does it often happen that the savage reaches the goal of his wishes by a road which to civilized man might appear at first sight to lead far away from it." (*G. B.* IX, p. 206).

the Sierra Nevada, will strike down on them, driving sin and sickness far away by their radiant influence." [9]

We have an expression, "open confession is good for the soul," which rests on the firmest possible foundation of demonstrable fact. It has already been pointed out that many, if not all, of the magical rituals sprang, in the first instance, from a purely natural and almost inevitable physical reaction. In their simplest and most involuntary form they constitute a mere discharge of pent-up feeling, under the compulsion of a single dominant idea which is, for the moment as irresistible as hypnotic suggestion.[10] But as the magical performance takes definite form, and the person allows himself to *consent* in what he is doing, it suddenly ceases to be *mere* make believe, and to take on a positive value as a means of *catharsis*. It "does you good" to kick the chair that insists on getting in your way in the dark (though we carefully teach our children to refrain from such outbursts of "temper"), and we all know the relief of "getting a thing off our mind" when we have finally faced the inevitable and said what had to be said, but which we have shrunk from saying, and have realized that it has been a cause of suffering to us as long as we kept it hidden. As I write, my eye rests on the morning paper,[11] on the first page of which is an account of the confession of a murderer who has succeeded in hiding his crime (he had ruthlessly hacked four people to death with an axe) for a few days over a year. Now, "to escape the tortures of his own conscience" in another city than that in which the crime was committed, and where he seems to have been free of the slightest suspicion,

[9] cf. Nicholas, F. C. "The Aborigines of Santa Maria, Columbia," in *American Anthropoligist*, New Series, III. (1901), pp. 639-641, on which Frazer's account rests.

[10] This is known as "primitive credulity"; *cf.* Marett, *op. cit.* p. 41.

[11] *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, July 19, 1915.

he voluntarily admits his guilt. Robbery was the motive for the crime, but the murderer failed of his booty because just as he had "cleared his way to the money a dog barked—and ever since, he says, he has been unable to sleep without hearing and being awakened by a dream dog's barking." " 'It was as I killed the last—the grand-daughter—that the watch-dog barked. I was afraid to stay any longer and I went away without the money. I have heard the dog barking ever since. When I try to sleep he wakes me. I have travelled all over the country, but the dog is still with me.' " [12]

I have already spoken of the paralyzing effect of fear, and it is easy enough to see that the savage, who knew only this effect would attribute some mystic might to the "impurity" of which he was fearful, because his vital energies were dried up at their source and he "had no heart in him." One of the most striking developments of modern psycho-therapeutics [13] is the evolution of a technique for breaking down the inhibitions which have grown up round the remembrance of the "accursed thing" and one of its most startling elements is the psychoanalysis of the sufferer's dreams.[14] We are only beginning to realize how deep seated and all pervasive is the influence of fear, with the other side of the same great truth,

---

[12] Sir Henry Irving's famous rendering of the "The Bells" at once comes to mind, and the scientific insight of its author is once again demonstrated.

[13] Reference may be made to Münsterberg, H., *Psychotherapy*, N. Y., 1909; Worcester, E., *et al.*, *Religion and Medicine*, N. Y., 1908; Freud, S., *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, N. Y., 1914; Brill, A. A., *Psychoanalysis, its Theories and Practical Application*, Phil., 1914.

[14] "There are, therefore, two exits for the individual unconscious emotional process. It is either left to itself, in which case it ultimately breaks through somewhere and secures for once a discharge for its excitation into motility; or it succumbs to the influence of the foreconscious, and its excitation becomes confined through this influence instead of being discharged. It is

how vivifying and compelling is the feeling of confidence which rests on *faith.*[15]

But what we are particularly interested in here is to emphasize the part that a sacred rite may play in removing all fear and thereby supplying that inward confidence of *purity,* that *catharsis,* which we are too prone to look upon as a "spiritual" thing and therefore to be "spiritually apprehended." Aristotle suggested that this was the function of Tragedy and certain kinds of music,[16] and it seems fairly well demonstrated that tragedy and the drama rest on the foundation of the initiation rite.[17]

---

the latter process that occurs in the dream. * * * We now see what this function is. The dream has taken it upon itself to bring the liberated excitement of the Unconscious back under the dominion of the foreconscious; it thus affords relief for the excitement of the Unconscious and acts as a safety-valve for the latter, and at the same time it insures the sleep of the foreconscious at a slight expenditure of the waking state." (Freud, S. *The Interpretation of Dreams,* (N. Y., 1913), p. 457.)

[15] " 'Any state of body,' observes the physiologist Müller, 'expected with certain confidence, is very prone to ensue;' and this follows not only in cases of savage religion, but even where religion itself is not the superinducing cause." (Brinton, *op. cit.,* p. 130).

[16] *Politics* V. 7.

[17] *cf. supra* p. 33. "In the face of facts so plain it seems to me impossible that the drama had its roots elsewhere than in the worship of Dionysos. Aristotle is right 'tragedy arose from leaders of the Dithyramb.' (*Themis,* p. 339). Plato had described the Dithyramb as related to the Birth of Dionysos, but without comment. (*Laws* 700). "Scholars, guiltless of any knowledge of initiation-ceremonies, have usually assumed that Plato has been misled by the false etymology of the Double Door. Is it not at least as possible that this false etymology arose, in part of course, from the form of an ancient ritual title misunderstood, but in greater part from the fact that Plato's statement is literally true, that the Dithyramb was originally the *Song of the Birth.*" (*Themis,* p. 32)

Some kind of ceremony or other, something *done,* or to use Miss Harrison's phrase "pre-done" is the foundation of all methods of *catharsis.* The very term itself is shared by religion and medicine, and for us to-day probably suggests medical practice rather than religious rite, but it was not always so. Speaking of the Arunta (of whom I hope the patient reader is not thoroughly tired), Dr. Marett says: "As is well known, their cult, whether it be classed as magic or religion, centers in the ceremonies connected with certain objects of stone or wood that they call *churinga,* the word meaning 'secret' or 'sacred.' A theology abounding in terminological inexactitudes enables all sorts of other sacred things to be somehow associated by the Arunta with these *churinga;* for instance totem animals, their legendary ancestors, and their own personal names. Nevertheless the fact remains that the material objects taken in themselves are reckoned as a means of grace of altogether superlative importance. Now when the civilized observer watches the black-fellow rub one of these sacred-stones against his stomach he is apt to smile, or perhaps weep, at so crude a ritual act. Let him, however, mark the black-fellow's earnest and devotional manner. Better still, let him attend to the account he gives in his halting language of the inward experience accompanying the rite. For he asserts in so many words that it makes him 'strong' and 'wise' and 'glad' and 'good.' This is not prayer, of course. Yet in a very real sense the savage asks humbly and is answered." [18]

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, founding his arguments wherever possible on well-known elements of the Jewish system of worship, declares that "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." [19] The elaborate provisions of the Levitical code fully bear out this assertion, but

[18] Marett, *op. cit.* pp. 190-191.

[19] Hebrews 9:22.

there is no doubt that *sacrifice,* as such, while almost indispensable to the higher and purer types of religion, is not "primary" but is itself a development.[20] In all probability, however, the transition to sacrifice came about through the peculiar paradox of the sacredness of *blood,* which made it both the source of the greatest contamination and also the vehicle of that purifying principle which removes all taint of defilement and sin.[21] Whatever may have been the first significance of sacrifice, once established as a rite it must follow the course of development and transition which we have found to be true of all *other* rites, and from age to age it would attract to itself the changing interpretations which accorded best with the religious ideals and conceptions of time. All of the elaborate sacrifices of the Jewish system may be divided into two general classes, each representing a different idea, each of which may possibly, at some remote time, have dominated the "myth" which accompanied them. These two classes of sacrifice are "peace offerings" and "sin offerings." One kind of sacrifice was offered as a token of fellowship or friendliness and devotion to Jehovah, in fulfillment of a vow or as a sign of thanksgiving. This type was accompanied by a feast at which part of the sacrifice

---

[20] The *do ut des* explanation of sacrifice, known as the "gift theory" *assumes* that the idea of an anthropomorphic god was primary. While we cannot enter into the argument, it must have been evident that I accept the theory which considers this conception itself to have been derivative. For a brief argument against the gift theory *vide Themis.* pp. 134 ff., and for the classic contravention of it, Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites, passim. vide supra* p. 2, n. 2.

[21] Both the Latin *sacer* and the Greek root αγ have the double meanings sacred and accursed, holiness and pollution. *cf.* Farnell, *Evolution of Religion,* p. 97. Leviticus 6:30 requires the sin offering for the priest or the *whole* congregation to be *wholly* consumed by fire, outside the camp, as being more polluted. *cf.* Chap. 4:3-21.

was consumed by the worshipper.[22] There was no provision for purification, it was taken for granted as a condition requisite of the offerer.[23] The other kind of sacrifice, the sin offering, on the contrary, was intended to take away any uncleanness or guilt and restore the offerer to the state of purity requisite of one who would enter into the presence of the LORD. Though there is some confusion in the use of terms describing this type of offering, it is quite evident that there were two kinds of sin for which offerings were required, sins committed "unwittingly," for which the sacrifice was called a "sin offering" [24] and those "trespasses" or *known* faults for which the "trespass offering" was required.[25] In both of these cases the sacrifice *removes* the uncleanness and pardons the sin. But in them the communal feast—logically enough, since the offerer himself is *not* pure at the time—is limited to the ministers at the altar.[26]

It seems to me to be an interesting fact that these two kinds of sacrifice, with their two wholly different meanings, and representing two convergent attitudes on the part of

[22] Leviticus 7:15-18; 22:29-30.

[23] "And as for the flesh, every one that is clean shall eat thereof: but the soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, that pertain unto Jehovah, having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut off from his people." (Lev. 7:20-21.)

[24] Leviticus 4 *passim* and 6:25-30. The ignorance applies to the *character* of the sin, not to the specific offence, for when a definite offence which was committed in ignorance becomes known, the offering seems to be considered as a trespass offering. *cf.* Lev. 5:2-5; 16-19.

[25] *Ibid.* 5:1—6:7; 7:1-7.

[26] The intention of the sin offering (in the comprehensive sense of the term) is well shown by the sequence of events prescribed in cases where both sin and burnt offerings are to be offered, *e. g.* Lev. 5:7-10. The trespass offering must be offered *first* to prepare the way for the burnt (*scil.* peace) offering to follow.

the respective offerers, suggest two of the possible sentiments out of which the use of sacrifices may have arisen, and that each of these has actually been urged by students working in *different* fields, as supplying the origin of sacrifice. Professor Robertson Smith,[27] studying Semitic origins advocates the communal meal as the *fons* from which has flowed the sacrificial stream of the ages. Professor Farnell,[28]

[27] "The one thing directly expressed in the sacrificial meal is that the god and his worshippers are *commensals*, but every other point in their mutual relations is included in what this involves. Those who sit at meat together are united for all social effects; those who do not eat together are aliens to one another, without fellowship in religion and without reciprocal social duties." (*Religion of the Semites*, p. 269.) "The distinction between the feast and an ordinary meal lies, it may seem, not in the material or the copiousness of the repast, but in its public character. When men eat alone they do not invite the god to share their food, but when the clan eats together as a kindred unity the kindred god must also be of the party." (*Ibid.* p. 280.) "The principle that the god claims his share in every slaughter has its origin in the religion of kinship and dates from the time when the tribal god was himself a member of the tribal stock, so that his participation in the sacrificial feast was only one aspect of the rule that no kinsman must be excluded from a share in the victim." (*Ibid.* p. 282.)

[28] "It is probable that in the Homeric and earlier period certain external objects used in ritual were regarded as mysteriously charged with divinity, so that those who handled them were brought into temporary communion with the deity through physical contact. The altar and the idol were both derivatives from an earlier pillar cult, and as divine power was supposed to be immanent in the sacred pillar or stone, which could produce certain supernatural effects upon those who touched them, the same efficacy was imputed to the altar and the idol, and the persons or things that were put into contact with them were regarded in some sense as consecrated to the deity. This, then, is one form of divine communion, through contact established between the worshipper and certain sacred objects, and in so far analogous to the sacramental ritual." ("Sacrifiicial Communion in Greek Religion" in *Hibbert Journal*, II (1903-4) p. 309).

studying Greek origins suggests that it began as *catharsis* by means of the outpouring of the blood of an animal, first made sacred by contact with the altar in which the mystic power of purification dwells.

At first sight these two theories appear to be in hopeless contradiction, but in reality they are two sides of the same truth. Purification is only to be acquired by *union with the divine* and the cry of the humble and suffering soul has always been "Make me a clean heart, O God: and renew a right spirit within me." [29] Whether union with the deity be sought through contact with the blood which represents the divine life, or through partaking divinity, the conception underlying the rite in both cases is a *participation* in the mystic power of the god, and both forms of sacrifice lead to a rite of mystic *communion.*

"Magic, sacrament, and sacrifice are fundamentally all one," says Miss Harrison. "They are all the handling of the sacred, the manipulation of *mana,* but usage has differentiated the three terms. Magic is the more general term. Sacrament is usually confined to cases where the ceremonial contact is by eating; sacrifice has come to be associated with the killing of an animal or the making over of an object by a gift. Sacrament is concerned rather with the absorbing of *mana* into oneself, magic deals rather with the using of that *mana* for an outside end. Moreover sacrifice and sacrament tend to go over to the public, ceremonial, recurrent contacts effected collectively; whereas individual, private, isolated efforts after contact tend to be classed as magic." [30]

Examples of this close connection between sacrifice and communion are to be found in many forms of religion. Let us consider one from the Fiji Islands, which retains its connection with the initiation ceremony and the drama of rebirth.

---

[29] Psalm 51:10, P. B. Version.

[30] *Themis,* p. 138.

"In certain districts of Viti Levu, the largest of the Fijian Islands, the drama of death and resurrection used to be acted with much solemnity before the eyes of young men at initiation. The ceremonies were performed in certain sacred precincts of oblong shape, enclosed by low walls or rows of stones but open to the sky. Such a precinct was called a *Nanga,* and it might be described as a temple dedicated to the worship of ancestors; for in it sacrifices and prayers were offered to the ancestral spirits. * * *

"In these open-air temples of the dead the ceremony of initiating the young men was performed as a rule every year [31] at the end of October or the beginning of November, which was the commencement of the Fijian New Year; hence the novices who were initiated at that season went by the name of *Vilavou* or New Year's Men. * * * As a preparation for the solemnity the heads of the novices were shaved and their beards, if they had any, were carefully eradicated.[32] On four successive days they went in procession to the temple and there deposited in the Holy of Holies their offerings of cloth and weapons to the ancestral spirits. But on the fifth and great day of the festival, when they again entered the sacred ground, they beheld a sight which froze their souls with horror. Stretched on the ground was

[31] One authority says that as a rule these ceremonies were held "only every second year." Dr. Fraser's comment is suggestive and illuminating: "Perhaps the seeming discrepancy between our authorities on this point may be explained by Mr. Joske's statement (p. 259) that the rites are held in alternate years by two different sets of men, the Kai Vesina and the Kai Rukuruku, both of whom claim to be descended from the original founders of the rites." *(G. B. XI. p.* 244, n. 3.). cf. Rev. Lorimer Fison, *Journal of the Anthropological Institute,* XIV. (1885) p. 27ff; Basil Thompson, *The Fijians, Archiv. für Ethnographie,* II. (1889,) pp. 254-266.

[32] On depilation in initiatory rites *cf.* Webster, *op. cit.* p. 35ff; Hair and nails were prominent in magic and taboo. *vide G. B.* I. 57ff; III.55, 159n., 267 ff., *et al.*

a row of dead or seemingly dead and murdered men, their bodies cut open and covered with blood, their entrails protruding. At the farther end sat the High Priest, regarding them with a stony glare, and to reach him the trembling novices had to crawl on hands and knees over the ghastly blood-bedabbled corpses that lay between. Having done so they drew up in a line before him. Suddenly he blurted out a piercing yell, at which the counterfeit dead men started to their feet and ran down to the river to cleanse themselves from the blood and guts of pigs with which they were beslobbered. The High Priest now unbent his starched dignity, and skipping from side to side cried in stridulous tones, 'Where are the people of my enclosure? Are they gone to Tonga Levu? Are they gone to the deep sea?' He was soon answered by a deep-mouthed chant, and back from the river marched the dead men come to life, clean, fresh, and garlanded, swaying their bodies in time to the music of their solemn hymn. They took their places in front of the novices and a religious silence ensued. Such was the drama of death and resurrection. It was immediately followed by a sacramental meal. Four old men of the highest order of initiates now entered the Holy of Holies. The first bore a cooked yam carefully wrapped up in leaves so that no part of it should touch the hands of the bearer: the second carried a piece of baked pork similarly enveloped: the third a drinking cup full of water and wrapt round with native cloth; and the fourth bore a napkin of the same stuff. The first elder passed along the row of novices putting the end of the yam into each of their mouths, and as he did so each of them nibbled a morsel of the sacred food: the second elder did the same with the hallowed pork: the third elder followed with the holy water, with which each novice merely wetted his lips; and the fourth elder wiped all their mouths with his napkin. Then the High Priest or one of the elders addressed the young men, warning them solemnly against the sacrilege

of betraying to the profane vulgar any of the high mysteries which they had witnessed, and threatening all such traitors with the vengeance of the gods." [33]

We cannot be certain, of course, just what the natives understood this rite to mean, or what it did for them, but there is every appearance of a mystic communion either with the ancestral spirits or with the "gods" whose vengeance they were to expect would punish any betrayal of the mystery thus revealed to them.

Communion with the gods through a sacramental meal may be traced back to the very beginnings of civilization. Professor Farnell suggests that it may have been a product of "Mediterranean" religious thought. He says: [34] "This mystic act, of which there is no clear trace in the Old Testament, is reported from Egypt, and it appears to have been part of the Attis ritual of Phrygia. We find doubtful traces of it in the Eleusinian and Samothracian mysteries; also a glimpse of it here and there in the public religion of Hellas. But it is best attested as a potent force in the Dionysiac worship, especially in a certain savage ritual which we may call the Thracian, but also in the refined and Hellenized service as well. * * * *

"The attractiveness of the mystic appeal of the Sacrament appears to have increased in the latter days of paganism, especially in its period of struggle with Christianity. That strangest rite of the expiring polytheism, the ταυροβόλιον, the baptism in bull's blood, in the worship of Kybele, has been successfully traced back by M. Cumont to the worship of the Babylonian Anaitis.[35] The sacramental concept was the stronghold of Mithraism, but can hardly be regarded as part of its heritage from Persia, for it does not seem to have been

[33] Frazer, *G. B.* XI. pp. 243-246.

[34] *Greece and Babylon*, (Edinburgh, 1911). pp. 25 ff.

[35] *cf. Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, (Chicago, 1911), pp. 66, 227 n. 32 and 34;

familiar to the Iranian religion nor the Vedic Indian.[36] In fact, the religious history of no other Aryan race discloses it with clearness, save that of the Thraco-Phrygian and Hellenic. Was it, then, a special product of ancient 'Mediterranean' religious thought? It would be important to know, and Crete may one day be able to tell us, whether King Minos took the sacrament. Meantime, I would urge upon those who are studying this phenomenon in the various religions the necessity of precise definition, so as to distinguish the different grades of the sacramental concept, for loose statements are somewhat rife about it."

In his *Cults of the Greek States* Prof. Farnell gives a detailed [37] and comprehensive summary of all the available information concerning the Mysteries of Dionysus to which we may turn for an account of the rite of mystic communion. In general, the chief characteristics of the primitive religion of Dionysus were ecstatic enthusiasm, self-abandonment in communion with the deity through orgiastic rites, chief among which was this savage sacramental act, and the unusual prominence of women in the ritual. The true significance of the Bacchic orgy or "enthusiasm" was that it carried the worshipper out of himself and made him ἔνθεος, "full of the god." [38]

---

[36] Though this is also the view of M. Cumont and one hesitates about questioning the opinion of two such authorities, I think there is ample justification for the belief that the *origin* of the Mystic Meal in the Mysteries of Mithra can be traced to pre-Zoroastrian Mazdism. *vide infra* p. 132, n. 40.

[37] *op. cit.* V. (Oxford, 1909), pp. 85-344.

[38] *vide* the discussion of ecstasy in Rhode, E., *Psyche*, (Freiburg, 1894) pp. 344 ff. "The various systems of 'grades and steps' by which the mediaeval formalist tried to satisfy his intellect, leads (*sic*) the modern student no nearer truth than this simple statement of the mystic that his soul had been 'away'." (Burr, Mrs. Anna R., *Religious Confessions and Confessants*, Boston, 1914, p. 350). "When by excess of mind, we are rapt above or

"The wild movement of the Bacchai, the whirling dance and the tossing head, the frantic clamour and music of the wind instruments and tambourine, the waving of the torches in the darkness, the drinking of certain narcotics and stimulants, are recognized hynotic methods for producing mental seizure or trance;[39] and the drinking of the blood and eating the raw flesh of an animal that incarnated the god is also a known form of divine communion. And what are we to say of the 'silence of the Bakche,' alluded to in the strangest of Greek proverbs.[40] Is it the exhaustion that follows upon over-exaltation, or is it the very zenith reached by the flight of the spirit, when voices and sounds are hushed, and in the rapt silence the soul feels closest to God?" [41]

Prof. Farnell refers [42] to a strange survival of what seems, without doubt, to be a remnant of the primitive Dionysiac rite, in the celebration of the Lenten Carnival among the Greek Christians in the neighborhood of the ancient capital of Thrace. The details of the rite need not detain us.[43] but the opinion of this learned authority is that "we can hardly

within ourselves into the contemplation of divine things, not only are we straightway oblivious of things external but also of all that passes in us. . . ." (Richard of St. Victor, trans. in Gardner, E., *Dante and the Mystics*, p. 178, *apud* Burr, *op. cit.*, p. 349.)

[39] Speaking of the sense of the divine presence, Brinton says: "It is neither an intuition nor an induction; it is neither an inference from observation, nor the conclusion of a logical process. A study of its aspect in savage life shows that it arises from the perception of the latent activity of the subconscious, from the strange sense of activity, will, and power, which, under favorable conditions of concentration (suggestion) it imparts to the more or less conscious self." (*Religions of Primitive Peoples*, pp. 59-60.)

[40] Paroemiog. Graec Diogen, 3.43.

[41] Farnell, *Cults*, V. pp. 161-162.

[42] *ibid.* p. 107.

[43] They are fully described, with illustrations, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXVI. (1906), pp. 191 ff., Dawkins, R. W. "The Modern Carnival in Thrace and the Cult of Dionysus."

suppose that this 'Dionysiac' ritual is a heritage merely from the late Hellenism that was powerful on the fringe of Thrace and penetrated the interior with the actor in the goat-skin.[44] We must consider it to have descended either from an immemorial peasant-religion, out of which the worship of the Thracian Dionysos itself arose, or from this very worship itself which has never wholly perished, though it has lost its name, in its own land." [45] So persistent is a religious rite when once it has become established.

The highest form of pagan religion known to us is probably that of the Orphic Brotherhoods which themselves evolved out of a sort of "reformed" Dionysus cult. [46] Here we find for the first time a clear indication of the ethical concept of sin, "the necessity of purification from it, and an ecstatic hope in a happy immortality, attained through communion." [47] This Orphic movement was an attempt to purify the mystic ritual of the Dionysiac mysteries of some of their barbarism, and to reorganize a voluntary "magical secret society, adapted once more to a reviving human need."[48] Of the emphasis on the human soul and the doctrine that it had fallen from heaven, we shall later have opportunity to speak, but here we must, for the present, leave the most striking instance of the "spiritualizing" of a religious rite, and insistence on its value as a means of communion with the divine and as the only way to purification of spirit, before the advent of Christianity.[49]

---

[44] His appearance here furnishes the "missing link" in the theory which connects Attic Tragedy with the Dionysus cult.

[45] *op. cit.* V. pp. 107-108.

[46] "Orpheus, the ideal of the Orphic, is a Dionysus tamed, and clothed, and in his right mind—in a word Apollinsed." Cornford, F. M. *From Religion to Philosophy*, (London, 1912), p. 195.

[47] Farnell, *op. cit.*, V. p. 239.

[48] Cornford, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

[49] On the theory that much of Orphic doctrine was derived from Persia in the sixth century B. C. when it first appears in Greece, *vide* Cornford, *op. cit.* p. 162 and *Themis*, p. 462, n. 4 and 5.

IX

THE PAGAN MYSTERIES

"Death was the first mystery; it started man on the road to the other mysteries." [1] The craving for immortality opened the way to the success of the ancient pagan mysteries which dominated the religious thought of the Greco-Roman world at the beginning of the Christian era, and no survey of the history of religious rites would be complete if it overlooked this mighty movement.

It is next to impossible to give anything like an adequate idea of the magnitude and importance of the Mystery Religions, within the limits of a single chapter, but, as Wendland says: "Christianity forced its way into the West over the same road and in the same century in which the Oriental religions made their great conquest," [2] and if we would discover the most potent of all the forces which have exerted their influence over the development of Christian rites we must look to the pagan Mysteries.

At the outset we must distinguish between the Greek Mysteries, the origin of which is hidden in prehistoric times, and the Oriental Mysteries, which began to find their way into the western world after the conquests of Alexander. With the former we have but little interest as they had ceased to be of wide influence before the Christian era,[3] though the

[1] Fustel de Coulange, *La Cité antique*, I. Chap. 2, end; quoted by Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, (Chicago, 1911), p. 99.)

[2] Wendland, P., *Die Hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, (Tübingen, 2nd ed. 1912), p. 167.

[3] On the Greek Mysteries *vide* Farnell's monumental work *Cults of the Greek States*, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1896-1909). For a

most important of them, the Mysteries of Eleusis, were still celebrated during the second century. The distinctly local character of this cult prevented it, however, from obtaining the widespread influence which attached to those other mysteries, such as the Dionysiac and those from the Orient, which did not enjoy the distinction, nor suffer the limitation, of being a strictly state cult.[4] The most widely known ceremony of the Mysteries of Eleusis is that to which Clement of Alexandria refers, and which is sometimes taken to have been a sort of sacramental communion. Clement is our sole authority for this rite, the formula of which was as follows:[5] "I have fasted, I have drunk the *cyceon,* I have taken

---

list of *general* works on the *Mysteries*, of which there are few, *vide* Case, S. J., *The Evolution of Early Christianity*, (Chicago, 1914), p. 287.

[4] Case, *Op. cit.*, pp. 295-297. The *fame* of Eleusis was very great, and some of its public ceremonies were most gorgeous and impressive. People from all lands went to Athens, seeking initiation, and it is probably the terminology of these particular Mysteries which fixed the Greek usage and finally passed into Christian literature.

[5] *Protrep.* ii. 21. I quote from Foucart's translation which slightly expands the original. Firmicus Maternus (*De err. prof. rel.* 18) thought such formulae were used as pass-words by way of identification among the initiates, and this interpretation is followed by most subsequent authorities (*e. g.* Case, *op. cit.* p. 294). Foucart (*Les Mystères d'Eleusis*, Paris, 1914, p. 377) however says this formula was not a pass-word, but the response made by the initiate to a question put by the ministers of the temple, once for all. This was done just after having partaken of the mystic repast, or just before entering the *telesterion*, where the initiation was completed. *cf* Arnobius, *Adv. Gent.*, V. 26, *vide etiam* Lenormant, P., in *Contemporary Review*, vols. 37 and 38 (1880), three articles on the Eleusinian Mysteries.

The *cyceon*, or barley drink is mentioned by Homer as a common beverage, used often for invalids, and supposed to have medicinal properties. It consisted of flour mixed with water, to which was added a little honey, wine or cheese, or perhaps some dried mint. (*Ibid.* p. 358).

that which was in the chest, and after having tasted, I have replaced it in the basket; I have taken it again from the basket and put it in the chest."

The chest and basket were both probably of wicker work, the common implements of daily life, which were sacred solely in this connection.

As to the significance of this ceremony, Foucart thinks that it is to be found in the fact that Demeter had drunk the *cyceon* when she was herself exhausted by her sorrow, and the cakes were made from the wheat or barley which the goddess had condescended to give to mankind for their use. By this partaking of sacred food the *mystae* were united to the goddess and by it they pledged themselves to her service.

According to Foucart's theory the climax to the first grade of the Mysteries was supplied by the enacting of the sacred drama of the Rape of Core, while the second rank of initiation, that of the *epoptae* culminated in a similar drama of the marriage of Demeter and Zeus, which provoked the scathing condemnation of the Christian Fathers against the immorality of the mysteries, a condemnation which Foucart thinks undeserved.

An essential part of the initiation was the λεγόμενα which accompanied the "things done." We have already seen that this is an essential part of all "magic" ceremonies, the true myth. Lobeck had supposed that this was a formal instruction given to the *mystae* on the religion of the temple and the arrangement of ceremonies of the initiation, but Foucart says: "there was neither conference nor homily, still less any dogmatic instruction. The words spoken were but a commentary on what the *mystae* saw." (*op. cit.* p. 418).

As to the significance of the Mysteries, Foucart thinks it consisted in the imparting of certain mystic formulæ which were to enable the initiate to pass safely into the realm of happiness in the lower world (pp. 424-425), but there was also the further idea of reanimating the deities by this yearly reenactment of incidents from the lives of the gods themselves. (p. 493, *cf.* p. 487). Farnell questions this (*Cults*, III. p. 182, 193), but agrees that the main purpose of the Mysteries was to confer the gift of a blessed life in the next world.

On Foucart's theory of the Egyptian origin of the Mysteries of Eleusis *cf.* Farnell, *Cults*. III. pp. 141-142; and for the significance

The myths concerning Dionysus combine in making him a stranger to Hellas, and his worship probably came from both Phrygia and Thrace to Thebes in Boeotia, which was his first stronghold, sometime before the Ionic settlement of Asia Minor (*i.e.,* at the end of the second millenium before our era).[6] In Greece, as in Thrace from which he came, Dionysus was an earth-deity of vegetation and fruitfulness, and the *phallos* was often used as his emblem.[7] The chief feature of his worship was the orgiastic enthusiasm to which we have already referred, but the principal *rite* of his cult was the *omophagia* or eating of the raw flesh of a bull or goat, in which the god Dionysus was supposed to be incarnated, and by which means he came to the votary and imparted the divine frenzy.[8]

During the sixth century B. C. Greece was threatened by Persia on the east and by Carthage on the west, and this danger had its share in provoking the religious revival which led to the formation of religious societies which sought to bind their members closely together by the bond of a religious and moral purity attained through a mystic initiation. Chief among these "brotherhoods" were those associated with the name of Orpheus, who was a reformer of the rites of Dionysus.[9]

---

of the initiation, the mystic drama, and his theory of their origin, *ibid,* pp. 130-131, 143.

[6] Farnell, *Cults, etc.* V. pp. 89 ff; 109-115; 125-127. The name Dionysus is compound and means "the god of somewhere" or "of something." The name is Aryan, however, and that of the Mother-goddess Semele is to be recognized in a Phrygian inscription discovered by Ramsay, which probably refers to the earth goddess.

[7] On the significance of *phalloi, vide,* Themis, pp. 266 ff and 311 ff, where their relation to the snake and the cornucopia as fertility symbols is shown.

[8] *cf. Themis,* p. 118.

[9] On Orpheus vide Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to Study of Greek Religion* (Cambridge, 1903), pp. 455 ff. On other similar

At Phyla in Attica, the home of Euripides, there were mysteries reputed to be even older than those at Eleusis, and there worship was offered to the great Earth-goddess "who was Mother and Maid in one" and to Eros, the spirit of love and life, later so prominent in the Orphic tradition. It seems probable that here the cult of Earth was primitive, and that the addition of Eros had been due to later Orphic influence. Whether the Orphic Theogany of the Hymns dates from before the Persian wars,[10] in which case the emphasis on the worship of the heavenly bodies would be a return to the more primitive worship of the Greeks,[11] or whether the worship of the sun by Orpheus was the result of Persian (Magian?) influences,[12] as seems quite possible, the fact remains that the Orphic reformation laid its emphasis on the worship of the sun, and transferred the abode of the blessed from the under-world to the realms above the heavens.

Orpheus himself was probably a real man and a devoted reformer. Strabo wrote of him, in the time of Augustus, believing him to have been a native of the village of Pimpleia, near the Thermian gulf [13] and St. Augustine [14] wrote of him, with Musaeus and Linus, that though called "theologians," because they wrote of the gods, they were not worshipped, "though in some fashion the kingdom of the godless is wont to set Orpheus as head over the rites of the underworld." The peculiar duty which Orpheus performed was

societies cf. Foucart, *Les Associations Religieuses chez les Grecs* (Paris, 1873.)

[10] This is the opinion of many authorities, cf. Cornford, *op. cit.* p. 178, n. 1.

[11] Socrates suspected that "the first men in Hellas recognized only those gods who are now recognized by many nations: sun, moon, earth, stars, and sky." (Plato, *Kratylus* 397 C.; *cf. Laws*, 885 E) *apud* Cornford, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

[12] *cf. Themis*, pp. 462-466.

[13] Strabo VII, *Fragments* 17, 18, and 19.

[14] *De Civit. Dei* XVIII. 14.

to inculcate personal purity of life. The growing emphasis on the individual was made by him the key to his system, which was preoccupied with the salvation and immortality of the soul, to be gained only by leading the life of ritual and moral purity.[15] The soul of man was from the stars and was imprisoned here in the flesh, "an exile from God and a wanderer," [16] but this could be remedied through purity. "The cardinal doctrine of the Orphic religion was then the possibility of attaining divine life. It has been said by some that the great contribution to the religion of Greece was the hope of immortality it brought. Unquestionably the Orphic believed in a future life, but this belief was rather a corollary than of the essence of the faith. Immortality, immutability, is an attribute of the gods. As Sophocles says:[17]

> 'Only to gods in heaven
> Comes no old age nor death of anything,
> All else is turmoiled by our master Time.'

* * * Their great concern was to become divine now. That could only be attained by perfect purity." [18]

The Orphic *cultus* did not maintain its separate existence, but passed, through alliance with philosophy, especially that of Pythagoras, into a "way of life." [19] In this form it merges

---

[15] "The Orphic ritual may be credited with two great contributions to religion—the belief in immortality and the idea of personal holiness." (Campbell, L., *Religion in Greek Literature*, London, 1898, p. 253).

[16] Empedocles *Frag.* 115; Plotinus *Enn.* IV. 8, 1; *cf.* the familiar hymn "I'm but a stranger here, Heav'n is my home," and *infra* p. 176 ff.

[17] *Oed. Col.* 607 trans. Mr. Gilbert Murray.

[18] Harrison, *Prolegomena*, p. 478.

[19] *cf.* Case, *op. cit.* p. 301-302; Cornford, *op. cit.*, pp. 194 ff. "From Dionysus come the unity of all life, in the cycle of death and rebirth, and the conception of the daemon or collective soul, immanent in the group as a whole, and yet something more

into the Mystical Tradition, the sources of which, like those of the river which went out of Eden, have never been discovered.

The problem of the Greek philosophers of the fifth century before our era was the problem of philosophy to-day—to reconcile knowledge with belief, reality with change. Parmenides and the Eliatics cut the gordian knot by declaring that change was unthinkable, and therefore could not be, and knowledge led to reality, or "that which is." Heracleitus, on the other hand, looked for reality in the actual experience of ceaseless change, and tried to reconcile apparent opposites within a comprehensive whole. We cannot ignore philosophy in our study of religious rites, for religion made up a large part of the experience of those days, and the solutions of current problems which the philosophers propounded were but the generalizations of their social experience, which included the popular cults and the religious traditions of their past. The theories of Heracleitus prepared the way for the system of Protagoras and the Sophists, and the "universal" of Socrates.

The problem of the Sophists, as also of the post-Aristotelian schools of thought, was to discover some basis for a new unity which should take the place of the ancient regime

---

than any or all of the members that partake of it. To Orpheus is due the shift of focus from earth to heaven, the substitution for the vivid, emotional experience of the renewal of life in nature, of the worship of a distant and passionless perfection in the region of light, from which the soul, now immortal, is fallen into the body of this death, and which it aspires to regain by the formal observances of asceticism. But the Orphic still clung to the emotional experience of reunion and the ritual that induced it, and, in particular, to the passionate spectacle (*theoria*) of the suffering God. Pythagores gave a new meaning to *theoria;* he reinterpreted it as the passionless contemplation of rational, unchanging truth, and converted the way of life into a 'pursuit of wisdom' (*philosophia*)." (*ut supra* pp. 199-200).

of social solidarity which was fast passing away. Protagoras declared that "man is the measure of all things," and applied this dictum to the practical problem of the disappearing standards of judgment in the break-up of the political and social institutions.[20] As in the sixth century B. C. the Persian peril had led to the rise of mystic societies, so again in the fourth, the conquest of Alexander not only opened the way for the influx of the Mysteries of the Orient, but these same Mysteries, with their new bond of fellowship and their promise of a supernatural knowledge, and a certainty of fixed happiness, beyond the power of even death itself, supplied the social need of the hour.

The earliest of the foreign Mysteries to penetrate into Greece, and probably the most important, was the cult of Isis and Osiris, or Serapis, as he was known in the Greek world. "Of all the gods of the Orient, Isis and Serapis were the only ones that retained a place among the greater divinities of the Hellenic world until the end of paganism." [21] This new religion was, in one sense, the creation of Greek dominion in Egypt. It seems certain that the worship of Serapis, at the Serapeum of Alexandria, was an expedient to weld together the Greek and Egyptian elements of the dominion of the Ptolemies by means of the powerful unifying influence of religion.[22] We have no conclusive evidence of

[20] For a brief summary of the Sophists, *vide* Rogers, A. K., *A Students' History of Philosophy* (New Ed., N. Y., 1913), pp. 41 ff., 86-87.

[21] Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p. 80. As will be seen later, Mithra gained no foothold in Greece. Cumont thinks that the doctrines of Orpheus had prepared the way for the success of the Isis cult, by its emphasis on immortality. (*ibid.* p. 231 n. 22).

[22] *cf.* Cumont, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-75. The question of the relation of Serapis to Osiris is a vexed one. The ancient world believed that Ptolemy Soter brought the image of Serapis from Thrace and set it up in the temple connected with his palace at Alexandria, in obedience to a "vision." (*vide* Tacitus, *Hist.* IV. 83-84;

the existence of "mysteries" of Isis and Serapis before the Empire, but even though this particular form of cult were introduced from Thrace, it merged very naturally into the ancient worship of Isis and Osiris in Egypt.[23]

As early as the time of Cicero, that is in the last century before our era, if not from the days of Sulla (cir. 138 B. C.), the worship of Isis had reached the Island of Andros, off the coast of Greece,[24] and Pausanias [25] is responsible for the statement that a statue of Isis was sent to Athens by one of the Ptolemies, testimony which is not of as much value as the imperishable marble in which the Hymn from Andros is carved, because there is less liability of error in fixing the date of the epigraphic text than in accepting the testimony of an author who records a tradition some three hundred years after the fact. Whatever may have been the process by which the worship of Isis spread from Egypt through the Mediterranean world, and the length of time which it took, there is ample evidence of the fact. The Serapeum at Pozzuoli, that busy little port of the Campania at which St.

Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, 28-29; Clem-Alex., *Protrep.* IV.; Origen, *Contra Cels.* V. 38). Modern scholars do not give this account much credence, *cf.* Schmidt, E., *Kultürbetragungen* in *Religionsgeschicktliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, (Giessen, 1909), Band viii. Heft 2, p. 47.

[23] *cf. Cumont. op. cit.*, pp. 229-230, n. 4. It has been thought by some Egyptologists that because no term has been discovered in the monuments which corresponds with the *word* 'mystery,' therefore none existed. Foucart points to Herod. II. 171, where a ceremony he witnessed is described as a 'mystery' and says: "On peut donc croire que si les Égyptiens n'avaient pas dans leur langue le mot de mystères, du moins ils avaient la chose." (*Les Myst. d'Eleu.*, pp. 77-78.)

[24] *cf.* Cumont, *op. cit.*, pp. 217 n. 14 and 230 n. 6. A similar hymn, in part from the island of Andros, is translated in Budge, *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection* (2 vols. London, 1911), II, 289.

[25] Pausanias, I. 18, 9.

Paul landed on his way to Rome,[26] was mentioned in a city ordinance of the year 105 B. C. which has been preserved,[27] and Caligula gave Isis and Serapis the "freedom of Rome." [28]

Though transplanted to Greece and Italy, the character of the divinities remained unchanged, and their power rested on the offer of immortality which was proclaimed in their name. Osiris was Lord of the under-world, and Isis his spouse was associated with him in the Kingdom of Dead, but seems also to have been a goddess of fertility as well. Gradually Isis displaced Osiris, or Serapis as he was called in Europe, and became the center of the Mysteries, the goddess of many names.[29] Cumont says of the spread of this cult: "At the beginning of our era there set in that great movement of conversion that soon established the worship of Isis and Serapis, from the outskirts of the Sahara to the vallum of Britain, and from the mountains of Asturias to the mouths

---

[26] Acts 28:13.

[27] C. I. L., X. 1781; I. 15-16. *apud* Cumont, *op. cit.* p. 232 n. 23. The Temple of Isis at Pompeii is one of its chief treasures, and the frescoes from it may be seen to-day in the National Museum of Fine Arts at Naples. They are described, as is the whole of the Temple, with much of its ritual, in Mau, *Pompeii, Its Life and Art.* (London, 1899), pp. 163 ff.

[28] Cumont,*op. cit.* p. 198.

[29] These are recounted in the last part of the 11th chapter of Apuleius' *Metamorphosis or the Golden Ass*, which is the great source for the details of the ritual of the Mysteries. (Butler's translation, Oxford, 1910, 2 vols.).

An interesting problem which has not been dealt with, to my knowledge, is the question how Isis came in this way to displace Serapis in the Egyptian Mysteries when they were transplanted to the Greco-Roman world.

A suggestion of the transition, even in Egypt is evident, I think, in the Tebtunis Papyri. In No. 78, line 12 ff. "Serapis and Isis" are mentioned; but in No. 299, which is dated 50 A. D., or about 150 years later, the order is "Cronos, the most great god, and Isis and Serapis, the great gods."

of the Danube." [30] But it was the religion of Egypt, though "viewed, interpreted, and apprehended by genreations of Greeks" that was carried into Europe, and Egyptian it remained till the end. "It was this Hellenized composite of old Egyptian religion and Greek preconceptions which passed out to give her a sanctuary even in such a provincial city as Pompeii, to leave such monuments in Rome as Hadrian's obelisk on the Monte Pincis, which in Egyptian hieroglyphs still proclaims to the modern world not only the deification of the beautiful Greek youth, Hadrian's favorite, as 'Osiris-Antinous,' but at the same time the enthronement of the ancient mortuary god of Egypt in the palace of the Caesars." [31]

Turning now from Greece to Rome, let us glance briefly at the Mysteries of Mithra, of which very little is known, save its great popularity in the Roman world, and its wide extent.[32]

---

[30] *op. cit.* p. 83. The most exhaustive list of all the discovered inscriptions and places where traces of the worship have been found is given by Drexler in Roscher's *Lex. der Mythol.*, II. col. 409 ff.

[31] Breasted, J. H. *Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt.* (N. Y., 1912), pp. 368-369.

[32] The monumental work of M. Franz Cumont is the authority on the subject, and contains practically every reference to Mithra in the literature of the ancients. It is *Textes et monuments relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, Paris, 1894-1899, 2 vols. The "Conclusions" of this work, comprising the latter half of the first volume, were republished in 1902 under the title *Les Mysterès de Mithra*, and this has been translated and published in English, under the same title: *The Mysteries of Mithra* (Chicago, 2nd ed., 1910). For some subsequent references, *cf.* the same author's *Oriental Religions*, pp. 260 ff.

Darmesteter's notes and introduction appear in the first two parts of the Zend Avesta, in the *Sacred Books of the East* (Pt. 1 in vol. 4; pt. 2 in vol. 23), but the third part is edited by L. H. Mills (vol. 31).

Cumont, who is *facile princeps* as an authority on this subject, thinks that Mithraism took the shape in which it was known in the Roman Empire, at the time of the Macedonian conquest,[33] though the first mention we have of it is not till 67 B. C.[34] There are a number of references to the ancient worship of the Persians, with some mention of Mithra, and then almost a complete blank until the references to the Mysteries of Mithra in the Roman world, most of which come from Christian apologists.[35] The real popularity of the

---

On Persian Eschatology *vide*, Mills, L. H., *Avesta Eschatology* (Chicago, 1908).

On Zoroaster, see the standard biography, Jackson, A. V. W., *Zoroaster* (N. Y., 1899); and the same author's *Persia, Past and Present* (N. Y., 1906).

The most recent work on Zoroastrian religion, with a theory which distinguishes the Magi sharply from the "Chaldeans," is J. H. Moulton's *Early Zoroastrianism* (London, 1913); *cf.* his smaller *Early Religious Poetry of Persia* (Cambridge, 1911).

On Mithra at Rome, *vide* Reville, Jean, *La religion à Rome sous les Sévères* (Paris, 1886), esp. chap. 3; also Dill, S., *Roman Society: Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1904), pp. 585 ff.

Mention should also be made of the early work of Haug, M., *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsis* (Boston, 1878).

[33] *Mysteries of Mithra*, p. 15, *cf. Textes et monuments*, I, 8: "The Mazdaism of the Persians, in combination with Chaldean astrology has produced Mithraism. We are led to conclude, therefore, that the religion from which it was derived must have been perfected in Mesopotamia before the fall of the empire of Darius." Moulton's view of the probable origin is as follows: "Through Herodotus, and to an incomparably less degree through other travellers, the Greeks knew something of the Iranian religion, untouched by the Reform." (*i.e., Zoroaster's*); "and the same, when contaminated with Semitic accretions, so as to form what we call Mithraism, became extremely powerful in the Roman world." (*E. Z.*, p. 226.)

[34] Plutarch, *Vita Pompeii*, 24. *cf.* Appian, *XI.* 63. 92.

[35] Herod. I. 131-140; Strabo, XI. 14, 9; XV. 3, 13-20; Plutarch, *I. & O.* 46 ff; *Vita Artax.* 4. Dion Cassius, LXIII, 1-5; Lu-

cult began with the Flavians, toward the end of the first century of our era, and with growing influence it became the most important element in Roman paganism, and so remained till its downfall about the end of the fourth century.[36]

The peculiar contribution of Mithraism was its rigid system of ethics, associated with which was its doctrine of ethical dualism, proceeding from the conception of two spiritual realms, one ruled by the Spirit of Light and Righteousness, the other by the Spirit of Darkness and of Evil. Mithra is the Lord of justice and holiness, and "for the worship of fecundity he substitutes a new reverence for continence." [37] One result of this is seen in the exclusion of women from his Mysteries, a peculiarity which was soon compensated for by an alliance with Cybele, the "Great Mother" in whose cult women were given a prominent part. The exact character of Mithra himself is very difficult to determine, no doubt for the very natural reason that during the centuries, as he has passed from Iran to Rome, it has undergone considerable modification. Herodotus was mistaken in his identification of this deity, taking "Mitra" to be a goddess,[38] but

---

cian, *Deor. Concil.* 9; *Menippus* 6 ff.; *Jup. Trag.* 8; Diog. Laer., *Proem.* 6. Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 70, 78; *Apol.* I. 66; Tertul., *De Praes. Haeret.*, 40; *Adv. Marc.* I. 13; *De Bap.* 5; *De Corona* 15; Basil *Ep.* 258; Jerome, *Ep.* 107:2; Greg. Naz., *Adv. Jul.* I. 70, 89.

[36] *Orien. Religs.*, p. 140.

[37] Cumont, *Orient. Religions*, p. 157.

[38] Herod. I. 131-132, Mr. A. J. Grant appends the following note to his translation *in loco:* "This mistake of Herodotus does not appear to have been discovered by the Greeks before the time of Alexander. Xenophon indeed mentions Mithras (*Cyrop.* VII, 5 p. 53; *Cecon.* IV, 24) and also Persian sun worship. (*Cyrop.* VIII, 3, sec. 12) but he does not in any way connect the two. Strabo is the first classical writer who distinctly lays it down "that the Persian Mithras is the Sun-god."

On the difference in spelling the name (Mitra) found in Herodotus, Moulton remarks that before the appearance of the name

Plutarch says the Persians call him the "Mediator" because he was in the "midst" between light and darkness, that is between Ormazd and Ahriman, and he goes on to say "And they tell us that he first taught mankind to have vows and offerings of thanksgiving to the one, and to offer averting and feral sacrifices to the other." [39] From the time that Mithra began to be known in the western world, there has been confusion between two distinct but similar views of him, one of which made him represent the firmament above, the other taking him to be the sun.[40] Probably the basic idea

---

in Old Persian inscriptions, the Greek writers transliterated the name τϱ, but that after the fourth century B. C., this form gives place to θϱ. He says: "We may probably infer a more exact knowledge of the Persian pronunciation, coupled with the gradual spiranting of the Greek θ which made it an exact representation of the Iranian sound." (*op. cit.* p. 427.)

[39] Plutarch, *I. & O.* 46, Goodwin's trans.

[40] On the meaning of the "firmament" or vault of heaven, *vide* Moulton's exhaustive note in *E. Z.* p. 391 ff. In his *Early Persian poetry*, Moulton says: "The 'firmament' of the first chapter of Genesis was very prominent in early Semitic mythology; and it is remarkable that the Assyrian *metru*, *'rain'* comes so near to Mithra's name. If this is his origin, we get a reasonable basis for the Avestan use of the word to denote a *contract*, as also for the fact that the deity is in the Avesta patron of Truth, and in the Veda, of Friendship. He is 'the Mediator' between heaven and earth, as the firmament was by its position, both in nature and mythology; an easy corollary is his function of regulating the relations of man and man." (*op. cit.* p. 37).

Herodotus associated Mitras (mistaken though his *identification* was) with Anahita, and with the other *nature* deities worshipped by the primitive Persians. Such an association of Mithra, as the firmament, with a goddess of "the waters" would seem best to answer all the probabilities of his earliest form, if we may judge by analogies with other cults. Or *he* may have been a rain god, as Moulton suggests. (*cf.* further on this point *E. Z.*, pp. 65-67 *vide et.* Case, *op. cit.*, pp. 311-312).

The transition to a Sun-god would be a natural one, as the

which underlies both views is to be found in the fact that Mithra is the Lord of LIGHT.

---

conception gained ground that light comes from the sun. which it does *not* in the first chapter of Genesis, at least. But on Moulton's hypothesis that the Magi were *not* Persians, and that they introduced sunworship into Parseeism, we would have the suggestion of a further *motive* for the change. I would also beg to suggest that we have the same change indicated in the familiar Tauroctonous group of Mithra and the bull. The primitive Iranian cult worshipped the Sacred Bull as the giver of all blessings, and a clever syncretistic expedient would enable the Magi to explain the gift of all things through the death of the Bull (*vide* Bundahis IV. Yast XXIX., Vendidad XXI. i. 1) by simply making the Sun his slayer!

This may seem a childish explanation, but less rational expedients than this have been resorted to in attempts to reconcile incompatible elements in the fusion of cults. And it seems to me that it has at least as much to recommend it as the solutions proposed by Cumont and Moulton. Cumont is forced to admit that the clever acrostic of Commodius (3d. cent. A. D.), on which he founds his argument, rests on a "myth" *which finds no place in the Avesta*, and he adds: "It appears that from a scruple which we cannot comprehend they have, so to speak, twisted (retournee) it, and Mithra, instead of stealing cattle, is their deliverer." (*T. et M., I.* 171, n. 7; *cf.* II. 13.) The uncertainty of such conclusions is well illustrated by the fact that in his edition of the Mihir Yast, in which the passage about Mithra delivering the cattle occurs (*i. e.* Yt. X. 22, sec. 86) Darmesteter adds a note which *just reverses* Cumont's explanation, identifying the stealer of cattle with a Vritra (demon) in the legend, and Mithra with an Indra. (*S. B. E.*, vol. 23, p. 119.) Moulton's explanation, on the other hand, identifies Mithra with Yima, the "prince of demons" who caused the "fall" according to Avestan mythology. (cf. Ys. XXXII. 8.). The reason for this suggestion is that the Yima's sin(?) consisted in the attempt to confer immortality upon mankind by giving them bull's flesh to eat—another noteworthy example of communion with the deity by eating a sacred animal. (*vide E. Z.*, pp. 148 ff., 356).

This identification of Mithra with Yima lands us in hopeless confusion, since, in the first place, the glory which departed from Yima was siezed by *Mithra himself* (*apud* Yt. XXII. 33, 34) and

Whether the ethical dualism which divided the realms of good and evil between two opposing deities was of Parsi

---

the *sin* of Yima is said to be the deadliest sin for the Parsee, that of untruthfulness. The connection of Mithra with the slaying of the bull must be accounted for, however, since it is so early and so prominent, and its right solution will certainly furnish us a valuable clue to the later Mysteries. In the Bundahis, the Avestan "Genesis,' the earliest record of the slaying of the bull is attributed to Ahriman, the prince of Evil (Bd. I. 3, *cf.* note in *S. B. E.* vol. 5, pp. 3-4; and the reference given above, Bd. IV. 1 and 2), and Cumont accepts this as originally the view of Mithra, that is that the Avesta, according to its earliest tradition identified Mithra with Ahriman. (*cf.* Darmesteter's *Ormazd et Ahriman*, p. 328 n. 3, from which Cumont borrows the suggestion. I have not had access to this book.) But this lands us in no less confusion, so far as the subsequent idea of Mithra in the Mysteries is concerned, a fact quite evident to Cumont, for he says: "Should we believe that the priests of Mithra recount the same myth in substituting for Ahriman their chief divinity as the author of the saving trespass? A strange detail which is repeated on nearly all the monuments, makes doubt impossible: the tail of the dying animal is decorated with grains of wheat!" (*T. et M.*, I. 184).

The only explanation Cumont offers for this startling substitution is the one suggested by Darmesteter's note, that a tradition grew up that final deliverance was to come through Saoshant (*cf.* Ys. XLV. 11) and that the conception of Mithra was fused with that of "The Deliverer." (*vide et.* Moulton's note, *E. Z.* p. 310, where the Zoroastrian identification of Saoshant with the expected son of Zoroaster is mentioned.)

The only point in which this theory resembles that of Moulton is in preserving the connection of Mithra with the slaying of the bull, so prominent in the Mithraic monuments, and clinging to the primitive idea that restoration (and if the myth of Yima be included, immortality) shall come through the death of the bull (and the eating of his flesh).

Now it seems to me conceivable that the Magi might for good and sufficient reason substitute their divinity for a Parsee devil, in whom they did not believe, but it is hard to imagine why they should substitute one devil for another! The simplest explanation, and one which all the evidence will support, seems to me

origin, or was the peculiar contribution of the Magi,[41] it

to be that what Zoroaster tried to banish from his cult was the worship of the primeval Bull, a nature deity which he could not countenance, and that he represented the sin of Yima as having been the rite of eating the bull's flesh. (An interesting parallel to Genesis and Adam's fall is suggested by the fact that *originally* Yima is thought to have been the "first man." *vide* Darmesteter's Introduc. to vol. 4 of *S. B. E.* p. lxxv.) But after Zoroaster's death the old cult reappeared, and against it the Magi, who influenced the latter parts of the Avesta, had to contend. This they did as I have suggested above. by simply accepting *in toto* the myth of the death of the bull, with all its blessed fertilizing results, *but* making *their* Sun-deity the slayer, and combining with their solar deity the primitive Mithra of the Vault-of-heaven, or perchance Rain, as the case may be.

A further advantage to this explanation is that it gives us the key to the interpretation of the Mystic Meal of Mithra, in the later Mysteries, since it would in some way represent the old idea of eating the bull's flesh. Cumont's explanation of this "sacramental meal" seems to me very unsatisfactory (though this would not *alone* constitute a valid objection against it), but this is not the place to go further into details, our discussion having already reached too great length for a note. (For Cumont's explanation, which is that they commemorate a banquet of Mithra and the Sun, and that it was, in some sense which is not made very plain, "opposed to the last supper in memory of which the Christian sacrament was celebrated." *vide M. of M.* p. 160; *T. et M.* I., pp. 175-176.)

[41] Moulton contends that this was "heresy" in Zoroastrianism, and that the introduction of Ahriman was the work of the Magi. (*vide E. Z.*, p. 129 ff.) It is usually considered a part of Zoroaster's own doctrine. In either case, it is peculiar to the Magi, as such, and comes directly into Mithraism. In the Mithraic Mysteries, there were offerings to the god of the underworld, as Plutarch suggests. (*cf.* Cumont, *Orien. Religs.*, p. 153, and *T. et M.*, I. 139 ff.; Moulton, *E. Z.* p. 127). Schrader (in *Encyc. Relig. and Eth.*, II., pp. 11 ff.) discusses the presence of belief in spirits, magic, and the worship of the spirits of the departed. Perhaps it was *this* that Zoroaster opposed. But according to Moulton's theory of the Magi, they were the aboriginal inhabitants of Media *before* the Aryan invasion, and *they* were the

had a prominent place in the doctrinal side of the Mysteries of Mithra, and the exorcisms and rites for overcoming evil spirits which now became so prominent in *all* the cults of the Roman world are probably to be attributed to this source. We have found good reason to believe that such ideas are characteristic of primitivity, wherever it may be found, but its recrudescence in the Greco-Roman world, where the progress of knowledge and culture had somewhat overcome it, is generally ascribed to the influx of the cults from the Orient, particularly from Iranean sources.

Among the other cults which came from the Orient, perhaps the best known and most influential was that of the *Magna Mater deum Idea,* whose meteorite representation came from Pergamum to Rome, amid great rejoicing and much pomp, on the Nones of April in the year 204 B. C. But that the Roman populace had not been wholly fickle in their devotion to their old gods, in spite of the verdict of the Sibylline Books, is shown by the fact that even a century after the arrival of Cybele at Rome, the populace mobbed one of her priests who came from her ancient sanctuary at Pessinus, to Rome, seeking redress for a fancied insult to his goddess.[42] But she was not doomed to perpetual seclusion within her temple on the Palatine, save for the annual commemoration of the deliverance which her coming to Rome had wrought, for the Emperor Claudius, prompted, perhaps, by the example of his predecessor Caligula in sanctioning the Mysteries of Isis, granted official recognition to the Great Mother, and her rites were henceforth celebrated "officially" with great solemnity.[43]

---

source of this ethical dualism, and had, besides, as their peculiar possession, magic, astrology, divination by dreams (oneiromancy) and the doctrine of the malignity of both planets and mountains. (*op. cit.* p. xi).

[42] Diodorus XXXVI 6; Plutarch, *Marius* 17; vide *Orien. Religs.* p. 52.

[43] On the Cybele-Attis cult *vide* Showerman, G., *The Great*

From Syria, sometime in the early part of the second century before Christ, came another goddess, who, though she came into the Latin world as perhaps the sole precious possession of Oriental slaves, was destined to play an important part in the religious life of Rome under the patronage of the Caesars—Atargatis, commonly known simply as the "Syrian Goddess." [44] Our chief interest in her cult is that it was intimately connected with the *Chaldaei* or fortune-tellers, who popularized the Chaldean astrology throughout the Roman dominions. From Babylon, through devious ways, no doubt, and mediated by the deities of Syria and Phoenicia, came new conceptions of deity and of a life after death, in the realms of the celestial beings among the stars.[45]

We have enumerated very briefly the most important of the foreign deities that invaded the Greco-Roman world, and no one of them had failed to find a foot-hold there before the Christian era. Without exception their cults were "mysteries" or religions of redemption, and offered to the initiate salvation from the trials and sorrows of this world, in a blessed life to come. As we have already seen, most of the

---

Mother of the Gods (Madison, 1901); Hepding, H., *Attis, seine Mythen und sein Kult* (Giessen, 1903). Other references will be found in Case, *op. cit.*, p. 302.

[44] Little is known of her antecedents or her rites. The only important sources are a short description by Lucian, based on a novel by Lucius of Patras, and a portion of the eighth book of Apuleius' *Metamorphosis*. The slave revolt in Sicily in 134 B. C. was started by a devotee of the Syrian Goddess, and her early association with the slaves is testified by an inscription of the first century of our era, which mentions the slave market at Rome. (*C. I. L.*, VI. 399).

[45] *cf.* Cumont's long note on the Babylonian origin of this conception, *Orien. Religs.* p. 253, n. 64; and his *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans.* (N. Y. 1912), esp. chaps. 3 and 4. The elevated character of the Syrian doctrines is referred to by Hippolytus, *Ref. Haeres.* V. 11, 7 and Origen. *Contra Cels.* I. 12.

Greek Mysteries had lost their hold on the people even before the rise of Roman dominion. Demeter and Dionysus continued to hold their sway, but they had to compete with Isis, and by the beginning of the second century there was a seething multitude of religious devotees, some of them the votaries of several deities at once. It was into such a world that St. Paul went preaching the Gospel of the risen Jesus.[46]

As might be expected from the secret character of the Mysteries, we know very little of their peculiar rites. There is a considerable fund of information concerning the more public ceremonies of the rites of Eleusis and the Isis Mysteries, but for the esoteric rites of these cults we are almost wholly dependent upon Christian authorities. Since the information they give us is found, for the most part in polemical treatises directed against these same "false" religions, and was probably obtained from converts who had renounced their errors, it is probably not free from prejudice.

From Theon of Smyrna, however, we have a brief summary of the essential elements of the Mysteries, which, though he writes in the second century A. D., can probably be trusted.[47] There are four or perhaps five separate parts, as follows:

---

[46] How, in the face of the evidence here assembled, the late Dean Groton could have said: "the Mystery-religions did not begin their development until the second century of our era, nor did they attain their great influence until a later date," I can not understand. No doubt he used words of sweeping import, intending them to apply only to his immediate question as to whether or not the ideas of the Christian Eucharist were "borrowed" from the pagan Mysteries. I agree with him that they did not *originate* in the pagan Mysteries, but, as I think we shall soon see, the sacramental idea itself came from a source earlier than the pagan Mysteries. (*cf.* Groton W. M. *"The Christian Eucharist and the Pagan Cults.* (N. Y., 1914), p. 106.).

[47] *Mathemat.* i. (ed. Bull, p. 18). I take this from Cheetham, S., *The Mysteries Pagan and Christian* (London, 1897), pp. 99 and 145, n. 61. Theon was a Greek philosopher, writing a treat-

1. καθάρμος (or κάθαρσις)—the preliminary purification. (To this, or next in order, Gardner adds σύστασις—the rites and sacrifices preparatory to the actual celebration.)

2. ἡ τῆς τελετῆς παράδοσις—the tradition of the "symbol" or actual secrets of initiation (also called μύησις).[48]

3. ἐποπτεία—the full vision (or highest grade, generally as at Eleusis, after a year, at least).

4. A weaving and crowning with sacred garlands, which completes the *epopteia,* and prepares for further promotion to sacred office.

5. εὐδαιμονία—the blessedness of union.

The purpose of the initiation, though this we have already insisted upon, was to bring about an intimate union between the votary and the deity,[49] and to confer, by this means the gift of immortality. This immortality was symbolized, if not actually begun, by the "new birth" which constituted the sole purpose of the primitive tribal initiations, and passed on,

---

ise on mathematics, and was probably as unprejudiced as any one to whom we might refer. A similar analysis of the mystic rites is to be found in Gardner, P., *New Chapters of Greek History* (N. Y., 1892), pp. 381 ff.

[48] For a full note on the use of the words τελεταί μυστήρια and ὄργια see Cheetham, *op. cit.*, pp. 135-138. "We may say that in the words μυστήρια, ὄργια, τελεταί, we have the leading characteristics of the Mysteries—secrecy, emotion, and edification." (*ibid.* p. 137). *cf.* Farnell, *Cults*, III. 127.

[49] "Theological myths suit the philosophers, physical and psychic suit poets, mixed suit religious initiations, since every initiation aims at uniting us with the World and the Gods." (Sallustius, *De Deis et Mundo*, 4, Murray's trans., *vide Four Stages of Greek Religion* (N. Y., 1912), p. 191.)

The "principle," if we may so call it, which underlies the Mysteries, is the one which we have seen prompted primitive magic and characterizes all primitive thought, that all *life* is one. *cf.* Cornford, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-112.

from stage to stage, into the more elaborate forms of initiation in the Mystery religions.[50]

[50] "All that we have learned from anthropology bearing on this matter is that most savages possess some kind of initiation-ritual and some kind of religious or dramatic show; the same is true of most advanced religions, and we may maintain that there is a generic resemblance between the lowest and the highest religions of the world. But it would be rash and futile to argue that therefore the observation of the Australian 'Bora' can interpret for us the incidents of the Elusinian drama, and all the religious emotions and conceptions thereto attaching. Probably the spectacle of a medieval passion play would be more to the purpose; and if, after a careful review of the evidence, we wish to gain for our imagination a warm and vital perception of the emotions inspired by the Eleusinian spectacle we probably should do better to consult some Christian experiences than the folklore of Australia though we will welcome any new light from this or any other quarter of the world when it comes. Meantime, on our present information, we can pronounce the central mystery of Greece innocent of totemism, cannibalism, human sacrifice, or of any orgiastic or 'matriarchal excess." (Farnell, *Cults*, III 129).

"Reincarnation (παλιγγενεσία) is, I venture to think, no mystical doctrine propounded by a particular and eccentric sage (*i. e.* Empedocles) nor yet is it a chance, even if widespread, error into which independently in various parts of the world men have fallen. Rather, it is, I believe, a stage in the development of thinking through which men naturally and necessarily pass, it is a form of collective or group thought, and, as such, it is a usual and almost necessary concomitant of totemism." (Harrison, *Themis*, p. 271.)

For a discussion of "rebirth" in initiation ceremonies, *vide* Dieterich, A., *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (Leip., 2d. ed. 1910), pp., 157-178. (The relation of this "magical papyrus" to Mithra is, however, to be doubted; *cf.* Cumont, *Orien. Religs.* p. 260; Case, *op cit.*, p. 329.) Reitzenstein, in *Archiv für Religionswissen, schaft*, VII (1904), pp. 406 ff., of which Cumont says: "These are perhaps the most striking pages written on the meaning of the ceremony." (*Orien. Religs.*, p. 238, n. 83). Reinach, S., in *Revue Archeologique*, 3e. Série, XXXIX. (1901), pp. 202 ff., for discussion of the Dionysus rites.

Though there were many separate mystery cults, they all possess the same general characteristics, and all sought the same end.[51] And they were reputed to be of high moral value in their day and generation. The Christians fulminated against them, and for political reasons they were sometimes persecuted, as was Christianity itself, but the philosophers

"These men the goddess (*i.e.* Isis) by her providence brings to a new birth and places once more at the start of a new race for life.' (Apuleius, *Metam.* XI. 21).

"For the gates of hell and the power of life are in the hands of the goddess, and the very act of dedication is regarded as a voluntary death and an imperilling of life, etc.' (*ibid*).

Harnack (*Hist. of Dogma*, Eng. trans., (Boston, 7 vols., 1894-1900), III. 164) says "deification" was characteristic of Greek thought, in the sense of *imperishableness*, and speaks of it as "brought to an edifying end" by St. Augustine, *cf. supra* what Miss Harrison says of Orphism.

[51] "The various Mysteries differed widely from each other, but certain general characteristics may be traced in all. All required some kind of preparation and purification before admission; in all there were λεγόμενα and δεικνύμενα or ῥῳώμενα words spoken and actions exhibited; in all it seems certain that an allegoric exposition was given of dramatized story of some deity or deities." (Cheetham, *op. cit.* p. 61). Here we find exemplified in the Mysteries the original use of the "myth" to which we have devoted a previous chapter.

On the growth of the *secret* character of the Mysteries, which accompanies the general break-up of social solidarity or "participation" and which we have already noticed as evidenced in the emergence of religious societies among primitive peoples, *vide Themis*, pp. 54-55.

"Lobeck (*Aglaophamus*, p. 47) compares the feelings of the newly initiated to those of the young Protestant Mortimer, in Schiller's *Maria Stuart*, when he was present for the first time at a stately act of Roman Catholic worship, in which, in

> die leuchtende Verklärung,
> Das Herrlichste, das Höchste gegenwärtig
> Vor den entzuckten Sinnen sich bewegte.'"
> (Cheetham, *op. cit.*, p. 138, n. 20.)

and educated men in general bore testimony to their ethical and religious value.[52]

It would be natural that the best features in these Mystery religions should be brought forward under the stress of their competition—not to say conflict—with Christianity, and such seems to have been the case. The pagan Mysteries reached their zenith during the second century and then sank rapidly to the nadir from which there is no rising. In most cases there is no formal record of their fall, but Jerome writing in 403 could say "already the Egyptian Serapis has been made Christian" and refer to the destruction of "the grotto of Mithras and all the dreadful images therein,[53] and in the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates[54] we find a distinct reference to the destruction of the Serapeum at Alexandria, "the very head of idolatry" as Rufinus called it,[55] and together with it a ruined grotto, once sacred to Mithra, but which "had long been abandoned to neglect and filth." Here and there in the literature of subsequent periods there is some reference to the persistency of some distinctly pagan rite, but gradually they have disappeared.[56] What has become

---

[52] For numerous references *vide* Case, *op. cit.*, pp. 290-297. The Mysteries laid a growing emphasis on the *individual*, and paid little heed to the *public* interest, as such. For this reason the gods of Egypt were driven out of Rome by Augustus and Tiberius; for the worship of the Roman gods was a civic duty, which the personal devotion of individuals to the foreign deities tended to disregard. (*cf. Orien. Religs.*, pp. 39, 44).

A brief reference to the influence of the Mysteries in Apostolic times is given by Scott-Holland, H., *The Apostolic Fathers*, (London, n. d.), pp. 30-32.

[53] Jerome, *Ep.* 107.

[54] Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.*, III. 2; V. 16; *cf.* Sozomen V. 7.

[55] Rufinus, II. 24. "A miniature from an Alexandrian chronicle shows the patriarch Theophilus, crowned with a halo, stamping the Serapeum under foot." (Cumont, *Orien. Religs.*, p. 232. n. 32, *q. v.*)

[56] As late as 394 the Isis processions in Rome were described

of them? They are no longer *pagan,* but many of them have their counterparts in such folk-customs as some of those we have enumerated in previous chapters, and *some* of them find their counterparts in the Christian rites and festivals which displaced them.

---

by an eye-witness (*vide Orien. Religs.*, p. 232, n. 31; *cf. T. et M.* II. 52, and for texts referred to in n. 54 *supra, T. et M.* II. 44-45.)

The car of the goddess Cybele was drawn on an ox-cart through the fields and vineyards of Autun, even during the fourth century, according to Gregory of Tours, who was Archbishop at the end of the sixth century. (*De Glor. Confess.* 76.)

X

THE CHRISTIAN MYSTERIES

THE question as to whether or not Christianity was influenced by the pagan Mystery religions has provoked an ever-widening discussion and much has been written on both sides of the subject. The difficulties which surround the subject are innumerable, but the greatest difficulty of them all lies, not in the lack of material from which to draw our conclusion, but in the fact that religion is so intimately related to our most cherished sentiments that calm judgment finds it difficult to weigh the evidence.[1] Were the subject under discussion something other than religion, were it medicine or weapons of war for instance, we should all be disposed to admit the reasonableness of an hypothesis, at least, that each generation had gathered and incorporated the achievements of the past in its own practice, though of course its theories and speculations would always outrun the more slow-footed and cautious progeny of the past, tradition and habit. In fact it is difficult to imagine any other way in which change or progress could take place.

And so it is hard to understand how a religion that was to *succeed* in the Mediterranean during the first century of our era could do so without taking up into itself all that was good

[1] The trouble with much that is written on both sides is that it consists so largely in special pleading, or *argumenta ad hominem*. Perhaps it is hardly fair to criticise, but by way of illustration only, I may mention, Friedlander's *Hellenism and Christianity* and Groton's *The Christian Eucharist and the Pagan Cults*. On the different types of opinion, with references to the literature *vide* Case, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-192.

in the systems of its competitors. Christianity might raise men's ideals and give them a new conception of life and salvation, but it could not alter the *mode* of thought in vogue at the time, nor, save after a long and tedious process, transform the fundamental ideas and sentiments of its converts. The whole history of the early growth of the Christian community reflects the influence of the pagan background of the church's life.[2] But "we may say at once that the early Christian's took nothing *consciously* from the pagan Mysteries." [3]

The gospel according to St. Mark, which is generally admitted to be the oldest, makes the baptism of Jesus in the waters of the Jordan, "the beginning of the gospel," so it may be truly said that Christianity began with a *rite.* [4] It may be objected that the preaching of John was anterior to the baptism of Jesus, and that the gospel of Mark begins with the preaching of the Forerunner, but it is nevertheless true that what John preached was "the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins," and the burden of his message was that the coming One would *baptize,* not in water but with the Holy Spirit.[5] So far as Mark alone is concerned, The Baptist has no other message to give, and his sole function, according to the view of the third gospel, is to introduce the baptism of Jesus. And the one essential feature of this baptism, in which the Synoptists all agree, is that at this time the Spirit, "as a dove," descended upon Him who was called the beloved Son." [6]

---

[2] *vide* Wood, H. G.. in Hasting's *Encyc. of Relig. and Ethics, sub voce* "Baptism" p. 397.

[3] Cheetham, *op. cit.,* p. 78. For a comparison of the "general tone and influence" of the pagan and Christian rites *vide ibid.* pp. 119-27.

[4] Mark 1:9.

[5] *ibid.* vv. 4-8.

[6] The same conception seems to be evident in the words of the Apostle Peter, when he tells Cornelius that God had "anointed

Baptism was a rite of purification familiar to the Jews, and it passed naturally into the Christian practice, but whatever may have been the significance of John's baptism *at the time,* by the time that the third gospel and the book of Acts were written, it was looked upon as quite distinct from the strictly Christian rite, for which, in some cases, it supplied a fitting preparation.[7] It seems altogether likely that the Lord did not himself administer baptism at all, but his final commission to his disciples was that they should go out into the world and do so, and the first activity of the newly founded Church shows the Apostles administering baptism in obedience to his command.[8]

---

him with the Holy Spirit and with power," *after* the baptism which John preached: ὑμεῖς οἴδατε τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα καθ ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ εκήρυξεν Ἰωάννης, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, κ.τ.λ. (Acts 10:37 and 38). But see next note.

[7] *e.g.,* Acts 19:3-5. What had transpired in the meantime we have no means of knowing, but it is important to remember that between the actual baptism of Jesus and the date of the record, at least forty years had elapsed in the case of the third gospel and nearly seventy before the Acts were written. It is quite possible that for the Baptist, or even for Jesus himself, the baptism had been related to the Messianic Judgment, for which it was to be a purification. But for the early church, after the death of its Lord, baptism was an *initiation* into a new social order, and constituted a *new birth.*

[8] John 3:22 and 4:2 seem to be contradictory, but there is no other reference to any baptising, even by the disciples. There is little reason to suppose that Christian baptism began till the day of the Pentecost. (cf. Acts. 2:38, 41).

This question was hotly debated in the early church. Augustine held that Christ had baptized all the Apostles (*Ep.* 163); Clement of Alexandria that he baptized only Peter (*Strom.* 3); Tertullian (*De Bap.* 2) and Chrystom (Hom. 28, *in Joan.*) argue with what seems perfect logic, that if the disciples did baptize before Whitsunday, the rite did *not* confer the Holy Spirit.

Baptism was considered so essential that even the Apostle Paul received it, in spite of the peculiar character of his "conversion" and Peter administered it to Cornelius the centurion and his household, in spite of the fact that they had *already* shown signs of being filled with the Spirit.[9] In the case of the Samaritan converts, Peter made a special trip from Jerusalem to "lay his hands on them" [10] but there is no mention of this rite in the subsequent account of his experience at Caesarea. It was only to be expected, however, that there would be some lack of uniformity in the use of these rites at first, for there were no *precedents* to follow, and each separate case constituted a new problem. But it is interesting to find that the earliest records make the church err (if at all) on the side of the use rather than the omission of the rite, as in the case of the departure of St. Paul on his first missionary journey, when he and his companion Barnabas were sent forth after another ceremonial imposition of hands.[11] A similar rite of laying on of hands seems to have

---

[9] Acts 9:18; and 10:47, 48. The emphasis on the necessity of baptism and its peculiar effects, in the writings of St. Paul, is somewhat overlooked. In 1 Cor. 1:13-17 it is the transformation worked by baptism "into the name of Jesus' which is the foundation argument. The gospel which he preached was the new-birth in the Spirit through baptism, and this could not come through any "other name." And again in Gal. 3:3-5 the question is how did the Galatians receive the Spirit, and though it is not answered in so many words, it is certainly *not* by the works of the law, nor by the hearing of faith, but it was in the rite of baptism.

[10] Acts 8:14 ff.

[11] Acts 13:3. The first extension of the ministry of the church, by the choice of the seven so-called "deacons" was formally indicated by the use of the old and familiar ceremony of the imposition of hands (*ibid.* 6:6). Whether or not it conveyed the impression of imparting by contact a mystic power which was believed to be the possession of the Apostles, this piece of ritual was a familiar symbol of blessing and the conferring of authority,

been associated, from the first, with the administration of baptism, though in some sense distinct from the actual baptism itself, and supplementary to it. It is first mentioned in connection with the visit of Peter and John to Samaria, in the account of which we have the testimony of Simon the Sorcerer, himself skilled in works of "magic," that, in reality, "through the laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was given." [12] It appears again as being administered by St. Paul to those converts who had not heard that the Holy Spirit existed, and here again the explicit statement is made that the Spirit came "when Paul had laid his hands upon them." [13]

There appear, then to have been at least two uses of this rite of the "laying on of hands" in the practice of the Church, as recorded in the Acts, and in the subsequent his-

---

and it appears to have continued to be associated with appointment to any "office or administration" in the church.

We find here, also the association of fasting with a formal rite. Fasting is associated with the ritual of purification in all ethnic religions, and especially with the pagan Mysteries; *e.g.*, "for ten consecutive days to abstain from all pleasures of the table, to eat no living thing, and to drink no wine." (Apuleius, *Metam.* xi. 23.)

[12] Acts 8:18. What Simon did not realize was that this power was not a *personal* privilege, but an official prerogative reserved to the "overseers" of the new society. The statement in v. 21 οὐκ ἔστι σοι μερὶς οὐδὲ κλῆρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ is quite independent of what follows. This rite seems to have been reserved, from the first, to the Apostles, as the chief ministers of the Church. The whole problem of its subsequent separation from baptism, and its elaboration as a separate rite is a very complicated one, but certainly one influence which must have led to some relaxation of this restriction was the growth and spread of the Church beyond the immediate personal contact of the Apostles. Another cause of some measure of change must have been the introduction of the custom of infant baptism, but of this we will speak later.

[13] Acts 19:6.

tory of the Church one of these came to be called Ordination, the other Confirmation. As the Gospel began with a rite, so the extension of its ministry began with a rite, and the earliest converts [14] from *paganism* were admitted to the fellowship of the Church by another and supplementary rite.

The first open contention *within* the Church broke out over a question of the use of rites, with a kindred question of purity or "taboo." The question of clean and unclean had threatened to cause a breach in the community on Peter's return to Jerusalem after his visit to Joppa and Casearea, but he had succeeded in quieting the scruples of the brethren who were "of the circumcision." [15] Now, however, the dispute had broken out afresh, and the issue had to be faced and settled, once for all, so it was carried to a council of the authorities of the Church, at Jerusalem.

Whatever *other* questions may have complicated the issue, in its baldest terms it was a conflict between the initiation rite of the Jewish Law, and the initiation rite of the Gospel. Was the *new* rite to displace the old, or were they both to be observed? This was the main question.[16] We must not overlook the significance of this perfectly patent fact, that the first recorded dispute within the Christian Church, the first that was deemed weighty enough to require the summoning of a formal conference of "the apostles and elders," had nothing to do with *doctrine* or with morals, except incidentally, and in so far as both grew out of the primary question of the *use of a rite.* The outcome of the discussion was the decision—if we accept the text as it stands—that for Gentile converts, who would not otherwise be circumcised, this Jewish rite should not be considered incumbent. It was

---

[14] Cornelius may have been a proselyte, but evidently from the account of Philip's labors, his converts were Samaritans.

[15] Acts 11:2-18.

[16] *ibid.* 15:1-6.

decided, once for all, that the Christian Church has its own rite of initiation, independent of the Law of Moses, and that no other rite shall be required for admission to its membership. But, as so often happens in "conventions," the main issue seems to have gotten side-tracked, and most of the discussion was given up to the consideration of the *subsidiary question* of purity. This is of interest to us here, because we have already seen that initiation rites signify a new birth, and as soon as they have developed away from the very primitive form, and the social group has given place to the voluntary society, the question of purity always forges to the front. So it seems as though it were partly as a concession to Jewish sentiment, which still governed those members of the new society who had been reared under the Law,[17] and

[17] The connection between the main question of initiation, and the subsidiary question of purity, seems to me to be found in verse 9, where Peter says "he made no distinction between us and them, *cleansing their hearts by faith*." It may be quite possible that the reason for the uncertainty of the text of the "Decrees" and the presence of a double tradition lies in the fact that the very *primitive* character of the restrictions has been overlooked. There can be no doubt that "evil spirits" and "impurity" were conceived of by everyone at this period in a very "material" way. They were *substantial*. The dispute over the use of contending *rites* would almost necessarily force the discussion *back* of the rites themselves to the more fundamental questions on which they rested, and *the* purpose, *par excellence* of *all* rites of initiation had for generations been *purification*.

Instead of comparing texts and traditions, to decide whether the Alexandrian tradition of a "food law" or the African tradition of a "moral law" forbidding the "deadly sins' was *original*, would we not get nearer the truth if we stopped to ask *how* it could ever have been possible for two traditions, *apparently* so contradictory, at first sight, to have originated? And the answer to *this* question seems to me to lie on the face of the account, so plainly evident that the textual scholars, who have busied themselves with manuscripts and "traditions" have failed to see it. It is the primitive question of *taboo*, of impurity and how to avoid it.

partly from their inherited conviction, which could not suddenly be overcome, that these particular things were dangerously contaminated and full of that mysterious power which we have seen has always attached itself to *blood,* that it was also decided to require of the Gentile converts that they abstain from certain *unclean* things. And thus a concession was made to those who had wished to have circumcision insisted upon, but in the final verdict, the *whole matter of the rite is left out,* and though what appears to be an observance of the Jewish Law, is required, the rite of baptism is left the only means of entering the Church.

Whether we accept the "three text" form of the tradition or the "four text" from the *Textus Receptus*, the thought which underlies them both is *impurity*, and we are prone to forget that the conception of *moral* evil is a comparatively late one, as the age of religion itself goes. Behind the question of *idolatry* lies the idea of evil spirits which *get into things.* If this conception did not still linger on in the Church, long after the Council at Jerusalem, why should St. Paul have to deal with it? What does he mean when he writes to the Corinthians "concerning things sacrificed to idols—if any man thinketh that he knoweth anything, he knoweth it not yet *as he ought to know?*" (1 Cor. 8:1-2) "The communion with demons" comes through eating things *in which* the demons are, and it is not the idols, which are nothing, but the evil spirits which are a *reality*, that count. (cf. *ibid.* 10:18-21.) St. Paul urges another view which denies the *inherent* evil of anything, and declares that the Kingdom of God does not consist in the observance of any set rules of abstinence, but the conception of union with God through eating of the sacrifice is too dear to his Jewish heart for him to deny that *similia causa* one would be contaminated by eating "things sacrificed to idols." (Rom. 14:14ff.)

If this really be the intention of the decrees, it is no longer necessary to insist that "fornication" is a later addition, for from time immemorial sexual relations have been the stronghold of *taboo*, and if, as the scholars tell us, the ascetic ideal came from Persia, where the doctrine of ethical dualism seems to have had its origin, it is not at all unlikely that the fear of contamination through contact with woman had a powerful influence in form-

There is no clear evidence of the *use* of any other rites in the New Testament, with the exception of the Eucharist, which we shall soon consider, though there are hints of those other rites which gradually assumed a place of importance in the life of the Church and finally came to be called Sacraments.

One of these is Matrimony, though it was many years before it was numbered as one of the sacraments. The classic passage to which appeal is always made in support of the sacramental view of marriage is found in the epistle to the Ephesians.[18] St. Paul says: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh. This mystery is great; but I speak in regard of Christ and of the Church." These are enigmatic words, and we can only hope to understand them by interpreting them in the light of the teaching of the epistle on the equally difficult subject of "the body" of the faithful.[19] But our chief interest in the passage is not its

---

ing the sentiment which led to the renunciation of the married life. The fear of the mysterious, the primitive concept of *mana*, which developed either into the sacred or the impure, is at work here, and we see its evidence in the view which the Romans held of the menstruous flow, which was both marvelous and deadly, (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, VII. 64.) The same conception underlies the prohibitions of the Levitical Code, (cf. *inter alia* Lev. 12) and has passed over into the Christian Church in the rite of "The Churching of Women" in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. This very idea of the peculiarly impure property of menstruous blood gives the point to a simile of Isaiah's which a puritanic rationalism has "revised" out of its reason. (Isa. 30:22.)

On the whole subject of "taboo" *vide* Crawley, E. *The Mystic Rose* (N. Y., 1902), esp. chaps. 8 and 9, "Sexual Relations;" but the "magical" is stressed by him a little too much.

[18] Eph. 5:31-32.

[19] The word body (σώμα; 3:6=σύσσωμα) occurs ten times in the first five, of the six, chapters of the epistle, and of the twenty-eight times that the word μυστήριον occurs in the New Testa-

exegesis, except in so far as the use of the word "mystery" is concerned, for the earliest comprehensive term applied to the sacred rites of the Church was this same word "mystery" and our word sacrament is only a substitute for it. The argument which would prove that marriage is a sacrament rests on this use of the word mystery and runs thus: mystery means sacrament; marriage is here called a mystery; *ergo* marriage is a sacrament. As the rest of our time will be given to a consideration of the way in which certain rites came to be regarded as Sacraments, let us pause for a moment in our discussion of matrimony to consider the origin and significance of this word sacrament. We have become so used to hearing of the Christian Sacraments, that few people ever stop to ask where they came from. The common answer to such a question, if one asks a Protestant, is that

---

ment six of them occur here. There can be no doubt that some "Mystic" meaning is intended. The "mystery" is primarily something hidden and secret, though also mysterious and dangerous. The whole context of the epistle convinces me that *life* is the great mystery of which the Apostle writes, and that he is drawing a parallel between our physical life and birth and the mystic new-birth in the Church and the life of the Spirit. It is the mystery of procreation, probably, to which he refers. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it"—not as we might expect, by his blood, but—"by the washing of water with the word," (*i.e.*, the laver of rebirth) "that he might present the Church to himself * * * holy and without blemish." * * * (as Christ cherishes the Church, which is his mystical body through this union, so—) "for this cause shall a man * * * cleave to his wife, &c." This seems to me to be the sense of the passage, and the expression "for the husband is the head of the wife, as also Christ is the head of the Church" (v. 23), when compared with the similar expression in 4:15-16 and Col. 2:19, points to the same conclusion, since in both the emphasis is on the "*increase* of the body." (For the view that it means a "mystic deification" *vide* Leitzman, H., *Handb. zum H. T.*, III 2, *in loco.*

they were given to the Church by Christ, and are to be found in the New Testament; but he will be referring to only two rites, Baptism and Lord's Supper. The Catholic, however, numbers seven sacraments, all of which, according to the teaching of the Catholic Church, were "instituted" by Christ, though he did not prescribe all the details of their administration.[20] The difference between the Catholic and the Protestant view of the sacraments does not consist in attributing them to a different authority, but in a disagreement as to their number, and a divergent interpretation of their significance. The worship of both Catholic and Protestant Christians has always centered round the use of these sacred rites, and they agree in the use of the term sacrament to describe them.

As is generally the case with names, the *name* sacrament was applied to certain rites which had long existed, and it was intended to describe the peculiar character these rites had come to possess. The English word sacrament may be said to be the creation of the Church, and it has no other significance or application than these Christian rites.[21] It came directly from the Latin word *sacramentum,* which Tertullian had applied to Baptism and the Eucharist, about the year 200 A. D., using it as equivalent to the Greek word μυσήριον (mystery) which has always been the word employed by Greek speaking Christians, and which we have found not only in the New Testament, but in use for centuries to indicate the pagan cults.[22] It is not absolutely cer-

[20] Council of Trent, Sess. 7.

[21] The dictionaries give no other meaning, though they sometimes refer to the *original* meaning of its Latin original or relate it to the word "mysteries."

[22] For the use of the word *sacramentum vide* Lupton's edition of Tertullian's *De Baptismo* (Cambridge, 1908), p. 1; Harper's *Dict. of Class. Lit. and Antiq.* (N. Y. 1897), p. 1395; Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma* (Boston, 1894-1900), I. 206 ff.; II. 140; IV. 202 ff; *The Mission and Expansion of Xty.* (N. Y., 1908), 2nd. ed., I, 416-417.

tain that this word is applied in the New Testament, to those rites which afterwards were called sacraments, but the usage of the Eastern Church, in the earliest extra-canonical writings, suggests at least the possibility of such a significance. At any rate, if the word "mystery" does *not refer* to Baptism and the Eucharist in the New Testament, then there *is* no

---

There was both a legal and a military use of the Latin term, and since the former had some connection with the Roman *sacra*, and Tertullian was a lawyer, it was generally supposed that this suggested his use of the term. But since the Christians were spoken of as *milites* the military oath by which the Roman soldier swore allegiance to his commander, or to the Emperor, is the more likely reason for the use of the term. The "Christian soldier" is still a familiar metaphor, and it has held its place through the centuries in the Baptismal service. The term "pagan" was a correlated term, borrowed from the barrack-room slang, in which all civilians were dubbed "rustics." (cf. Bigg, Chas., *The Origins of Christianity* (Oxford, 1909), p. 98; Harnack, *Miss. and Expan.*, I, 416.

The identification of μυστήριον with *sacramentum* which Tertullian established, was carried out in the Vulgate, where it is used seven times to translate the Greek word; (Dan. 2:18, 30, 47; 4:6=Eng. 4:9; Tobit 12:7; Wis. 2:22; 6:24=LXX 6:22). The parallelism is emphasized by the use of *mysteria* in eight passages (Judith 2:2; Ecclus. 22:27=LXX. 22:22; 27:24=LXX. 27:21; Dan. 2:19, 27, 28, 29; and 2 Mac. 13:21). Of the other seven passages where the word Μυστήριον appears in the LXX., two are omitted, and the other five are expressed by circumlocution: Wisdom 14:15—*sacra;* 14:23—*obscura sacrificia;* Ecclus. 27:17=LXX. 27:16—*denudat arcana;* 27:19=LXX. 27:17—*denudaveris*, object omitted; 27:24=LXX. 27:21—*denudari autem amici mysteria*). It will be noticed that this last verse includes *mysteria*, and is mentioned twice. So in Daniel 4:9 of the Hebrew and English, and 4:6 of the LXX. and Vulgate both words occur, and the parallellism is established thus: μυστήριον=*sacramentum*=secret.

The Greek word occurs in the Old Testament only nine times, all of which are in the book of Daniel, where it is used to translate the Hebrew word for secret.

The word μυστήριον occurs 28 times in the New Testament.

generic term for them in the canonical writings, and the use of such a comprehensive term must be later than the New Testament. But here we are considering *things,* not merely the names for them, and we have already traced the presence of the rite of "Baptism+Laying on of hands," and we were discussing matrimony, when we made this digression to speak of the use of the word "mystery" which we found related to marriage in Paul's use of the term.

Three of these occur in the Synoptists, in the passage "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven (of God)" in Matt. 13:11=Mk. 4:11=Lk. 8:10; four are in the Revelation, and the rest (21 times) occur in the Epistles of St. Paul.

A comparison of all the passages shows the following uses of the word:

1. In the sense of something secret or hidden:
   "of the kingdom of heaven"—Matt. 13:11.
   "of the kingdom of God"—Mk. 4:11; Lk. 8:10.
   "of God"—1 Cor. 2:1—Eng. Testimony (*apud.* Text. Rec.); Rev. 10:7.
   "which hath been kept in silence" (A. V. 'secret')—Rom. 16:25. (*cf. infra* Eph. and Col.)
   "God's wisdom"—1 Cor. 2:7.
   "know all m. and knowledge"—1 Cor. 13:2.
   "he that speaketh in a tongue * * * speaketh mysteries"—1 Cor. 14:2.
2. More specifically,
   a) The "name" of the woman—Rev. 17:5, 7.
   b) "of the seven stars"—Rev. 1:20.
   c) "of lawlessness"—2 Thess. 2:7.
   d) "of godliness"—1 Tm. 3:16.
   e) "of his will"—Eph. 1:9.
   f) concerning the resurrection—1 Cor. 15:51.
   g) the hardening of the hearts of the Jews—Rom. 11:25.
3. This leaves *eleven* passages in which the meaning is more or less indefinite, but related:
   "by revelation was made known unto me the mystery * * * of Christ; which in other generations was not made known * * * that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and fellow members of the body."—Eph. 3:3-6 (twice).

The idea that even lawful wedlock had in it some taint of impurity and evil, though surely not derived from the teaching of Christ himself, seems to have been present in the early church. If there had not been some tendency to depreciate

---

"that they may know the mystery of God (even) Christ, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"—Col. 2:2-3.

"the mystery of Christ"—Col. 4.3.

"to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery which for ages hath been hid in God * * * according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord: in whom we have boldness and access in confidence through our faith in him."—Eph. 3:9-12.

"To make known with boldness the mystery of the gospel." —Eph. 6:19.

"* * * the church; whereof I was made a minister, accordto the dispensation of God which was given me to you ward, to fulfill the word of God (even) the mystery which hath been hid for ages and generations: but now hath it been manifested to his saints to whom God was pleased to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory."—Col. 1:24-27 (twice).

"holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience." —1 Tim. 3:9.

"This mystery is great: but I speak in regard of Christ and of the Church."—Eph. 5:32.

"Let a man so account of us as ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God."—1 Cor. 4:1.

Whether there is really any "development" in the thought in these passages or not, I have tried to arrange them in the order of their apparent "objective" explicitness. In this connection it is of interest to notice that while there is but one instance of the use of the word μυστήριον in second Thessalonians, and that in quite an unusual sense, there are 6 in 1 Cor., but 2 in Rom., and 4 in Colossians, and not only is this the generally accepted order in which the epistles were written, but the application of the term to Christ, and the beginning "in Christ" are all found in

marriage, the exhortation in the Epistle of the Hebrews, "let marriage be had in honor among all" would hardly have been necessary, and the attitude of St. Paul towards matrimony may be said to have been one of suffrance rather than approval.[23] Of the actual administration of Christian marriage we have no mention in the New Testament, though St. Paul has much to say of certain restrictions laid upon the faithful in this respect,[24] and as marriage is, even today, a *social* rather than a religious ceremony, it did not come under the control of the Church till late.[25]

Colossian's and Ephesians. Of the latter Moffatt says: "The epistles to Timotheus and Titus, together with Ephesians, are probably Pauline rather than Paul's." (*Introd. to the Lit. of the N. T.* (N. Y., 1914), p. 63.) On the doubtful passage, Rom. 16:25-27, which contains one of our examples, *vide ibid.*, pp. 139 ff.

We are not interested, primarily, in the use of terms from the Mystery religions, in the New Testament, but solely in the use of the term "mystery" for the sacred rites which came to be all important in the subsequent history of the Church.

On the use of Mystery-terminology by St. Paul, *vide* Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 156; Reitsenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (Leips., 1910), p. 95ff.; Lake, K., *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (Lond., 1911), p. 44ff. *et al;* Kennedy, H. A. A., *St. Paul and and the Mystery-Religions* (Lond., 1913), p. 115ff., who is interested in disproving any direct influence; for other references *vide* Case, *op. cit.* p. 350.

While it is probably true that the common terminology of the Mysteries was used popularly, in a very general way, something as the word "christen" has come to be among us, and while it is also undoubted that many of the words are to be found also in the Old Testament, if we are to look for an explanation of St. Paul's use of these terms, in writing to the Gentiles, should we not find it in the former source rather than the latter?

[23] Heb. 13:4 *cf.* 1 Cor. 7:1, 7, 38. It seems as though the ascetic spirit to which we have already referred in the notes, had profoundly influenced St. Paul, and though he *defends* marriage, he does not counsel it.

[24] 1 Cor. 7:12ff.; 2 Cor. 6:14ff.

[25] Duchesne says "Il faut descendre jusqu' au temps du pape

We have now reached the limits of the evidence for the *use* of any sacred rites, in the New Testament, except the Eucharist, the discussion of which I shall postpone till the last. But, as I have said, there are some *hints* of the existence of two other rites, though no mention of their actual *use*.

The first of these is the public confession of sins. The remission of sins is associated with the earliest instance of Christian baptism, and in a subsequent example of conversion we are told that "many also of them that believed came, confessing, and declaring their deeds" [26] where two very significant things are to be noted: first, that those who are said to have confessed were already Christians, since there is no mention of their being baptized at the time, which apparently refers to the whole period of Paul's sojourn in Ephesus. They had been baptised, there is every reason to believe from the context, *previously,* and now they came and openly confessed the sins they had subsequently committed. The second point of interest is the use, in this particular connection of the word, *exomologesis,* which is the word that the Greek speaking Christians used for the sacrament of Penance.[27]

The Epistle of James has a specific recommendation of the use of anointing in the case of sickness.[28] We are perhaps

Nicolas I. pour trouver une description un peu éntendu des rites, du marriage dans l'Eglise latine." (*Origines du Culte Chrétien.* (Paris, 1902.) Eng. trans. *Christian Worship,* 4th ed., Lond., 1912, 3d. ed., pp. 428-429). This would be in the middle of the ninth century. The only reference earlier than this which he can give is Tertul. *Ad Uxor.* II. 9.

[26] Acts 19:18—Πολλοί τε τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἤρχοντο ἐξομολογούμενοι καὶ αναγγέλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν·

[27] The word appears in Barnabas xix. 12.

[28] Jas. 5:13—"Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him."

justified in assuming from this passage that such anointing was a recognized rite, since it is evidently to be done formally and by the official ministers of the Church, but there is no further mention of its use.[29] No definite effect is directly attributed to the act of anointing itself, in fact it is the *prayer* which it is said will "save him that is sick" and the power of his recovery is ascribed to the Lord. But the result of the whole proceeding is to be the remission of his sin, and perhaps we may assume, on the basis of our study, that the prayer is the "myth" which accompanies the rite.

We find, then, that there is, in the New Testament, positive evidence of the use of only three Christian rites besides the Lord's Supper, while there is but the bare mention of those other rites which, after the lapse of several centuries, came to be esteemed, together with these four, as the seven Sacraments of the Church.

The consideration of the most important of all Christian rites, the Holy Eucharist, has been postponed till the last for two reasons. In the first place, there is, strangely enough, so little plain reference to its use anywhere in the New Testament, outside the first epistle to the Corinthians, that, had it not already been *in use* as a sacred rite, before a single word of the New Testament had been written, we can not conceive of any one's discovering it in these writings themselves —except as the actual Supper of the Lord is recorded to have taken place—or finding sufficient justification in them for the inception of its use as the central rite of Christian worship. In the second place, because as a matter of actual fact, it *did* unquestionably assume that place, it is the most important of all the sacraments and round it the controversies of the ages have raged, so that the most of our further study will be concerned with this as the representative Christian rite.

---

[29] The reference in Mk. 6:13 is much less formal and seems quite different in intent.

The brief account in the three synoptic gospels is well known.[30] But the most detailed account is found in I Corinthians 1:23-34, where it is clearly a well articulated rite and the center of worship. There are two very striking things about St. Paul's account. He begins with the words "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." [31] Strange words, these, since there is no reason to believe that they refer to an incident in his conversion experience. When and how *could* Paul have "received" this important tradition from his Lord? There seems to be but one answer. It came to him when first, as a faithful Christian, fully admitted to the privileges of his membership in the Church, he took part in the sacred rite of the Eucharist, and heard those sacred words recited by the "president" who conducted the rite. They came to him "officially" when he was charged with the duties and responsibilities of an "Apostle" in the Church of Christ, and in this capacity he had himself administered the rite in the Corinthian Church. "From the Lord" they had come, in the unbroken tradition of the most sacred rite of the new religion, and we may consider the words as he set them down in his epistle, as the "myth" which accompanied that rite. From that day to this they have appeared, practically without change, in every one of the numerous Liturgies which have come into use in the various parts of the Church.[32]

The other interesting feature of what St. Paul has to say is his declaration that "as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." [33]

---

[30] Mat. 26:26-29; Mk.14:22-25; Lk. 22:17-20. Only in the latter do the significant words "this do in remembrance of me" occur.

[31] Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ὅ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμίν.

[32] For these Liturgies *vide* Brightman, F. E., *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, vol. I. Eastern Liturgies, Oxford, 1896.

[33] * * * τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε * * * (v. 26).

In the light of the survey of religious rites which we have made, and in the light of the well known δρώμενον of the Greek Mysteries, with which the Corinthians could hardly have been unfamiliar, it seems to me there is but one natural interpretation of this expression. The Eucharist, the sacred rite of Christian worship, is the dramatic representation of the death of Jesus on the cross.

We are not here concerned with any doctrinal interpretation of the commemoration of the Lord's Supper, as it is generally considered to be, but in the *origin* of this important Christian rite, and it seems quite possible, to say the least, that while all the ritual acts of the rite, together with the words which accompany those acts are derived from the Last Supper, the *rite as such* originated in a desire for communion with Jesus Christ, believed to be the Son of God, and does, actually constitute a dramatic representation of his *death.*

It is quite impossible, within the limits imposed upon us, to trace in detail the history of the use of all these sacraments, but it is important that we should realize how unremitting has been their use, and what a vital need they have filled in the life of the Church.

In the first persecution of the Christians in which *religion* was really the ground for the persecution, that under Domitian in 95 A. D., it was not for what the Christians believed that they were put to death, but because they refused to take part in the seemingly innocuous *rite* of offering sacrifice to the Emperor. It was for this reason that they were called "atheists" and the use of a rite came to be a matter of life or death. [34]

Somewhat later, under Trajan, we learn from Pliny's letters that those Christians who refused to offer incense before the statue of the Emperor and to make a libation of wine, were condemned to death. And here again it is wholly a

[34] Dio Cassius, *Hist Rom.* 67, 14; cf. Suetonius, *Claud.* 25, 4. Beurlier, E., *Le Culte Imperial* (Paris, 1891), p. 272.

question of rites, and one of the earliest accounts we have of Christian *worship* is to be found in these same letters of Pliny, in which he describes with considerable detail the Christian *rites*.[35]

In the second Apology of Justin, who suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius some time about 165 A. D., twelve chapters are given up to defending the Christians against the charges of godlessness and hostility to the state, and seven chapters (61-67) are devoted to a description of the rites of divine service. But Justin was, above all else, a philosopher, and occupies forty-eight chapters of his Apology with a defence of the moral teaching of Christianity, and a comparison of its teachings with those of the heathen religions. This is a new emphasis on "doctrine" and the beginning of the intellectual interest which ended in the elaborate "Systems" of theology, but in spite of it the rite remains central, and finally attracts the theological controversies to itself. But we are now nearing the end of the second century of the Christian era.

What indication of the use of the Sacraments can we find in Justin's writings?

He speaks of baptism as a "washing called illimination," which is administered in the name of the Trinity, and confers the remission of sins,[36] and as a "washing into regeneration" [37] and in his Dialogue with Trypho [38] he writes: "Accordingly, God, anticipating all the sacrifices which we offer through his name, and which Jesus the Christ enjoined us to offer, *i. e.*, the Eucharist of the bread and the cup, and which are presented by Christians in all places throughout the world, bears witness that they are well pleasing to Him."

---

[35] Pliny's *Letters to Trajan*, esp. Nos. 96 and 98; *cir.* 112 A. D.

[36] *Apol.* I. 61. *vide infra.* p. 188 n. 37 for the use of the term "illuminati."

[37] *ibid.* c. 66.

[38] c. 117.

There seems to be no specific mention of the other sacraments in Justin, but such mention would not accord well with the purpose of an apostolic treatise, addressed to those outside the Church.

There is ample evidence for these others, however, in the writers both before and after Justin. The Epistle of Barnabas speaks of *exomologesis,* but in such a way that the confession seems to be addressed only to God, though the pardon is publicly pronounced in the Church,[39] and the Didache says "In the church thou shalt acknowledge thy transgressions and thou shalt not come near for thy prayer with an evil conscience.[40] The sacred ministry of the Church has taken very definite shape before the martyrdom of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and in his epistle to Smyreans he speaks of that Eucharist being valid which was presided over by the Bishop or his deputy,[41] and Clement of Alexandria mentions three "grades" of the sacred ministry.[42] Confirmation, as we have seen, was at first almost a part of the initiatory rite, so closely was it associated with baptism. Tertullian still treats it as so associated, calling it by a name which appears to have been the accepted use for this rite even in the New Testament, but which is not there perfectly explicit, except when one knows the rite already by that name, that is the "seal." [43] Clement of Alexandria, on the other hand, writ-

---

[39] Barnabas, *Ep.* c. 19. *cf.* Clement, *1st. Ep.*, 2.

[40] *Didache* iv. 14. The date is probably about 150 A. D. (Krüger, G., *Hist. of Early Xtian Lit.*, Eng. trans. (N. Y., 1897) p. 67)

[41] c. 8. Doubts as to the historicity of his martyrdom have been expressed (*vide* Krüger, *op. cit.*, p. 38). On the double recension of his epistles *vide* Lightfoot, J. B., *The Apostolic Fathers*, (London, 1912), p. 100.

[42] *Strom.* VI. 13. Apostle is used interchangeably with Bishop. Clement wrote about 200 A. D.

[43] Tertullian, *De Bap.* 6; 8; *obsignata*=σφραγῖδα cf. 2 Cor 1:22; Eph. 1:13 *et al.*

ing at about the same time as Tertullian, treats the "blessed seal" as though it were *separate* from baptism [44] and when we get to Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, it is treated as a separate sacrament.[45] There is very little mention of Unction as a separate rite. Tertullian discusses, in connection with baptism, an anointing the meaning of which is not clear.[46] Clement of Alexandria speaks of an "unguent of faith" which again is inconclusive.[47] In the Apostolic Constitutions, however, we find a clear reference to the mystic oil "blessed by the high-priest for the remission of sins" [48] which can hardly be anything but the chrism used in Unction.[49]

Enough has been said to prove that down to the middle of the third century the seven sacred rites which are commonly called the Sacraments were in constant use, though there is considerable difference in the frequency of reference to them, and some confusion between them.[50] This is only what we should expect, since rites do not spring up in a day. Baptism and Confirmation originally constituted together the initiation rite into the Christian community. We have discovered evidence of their separation and the establishment of two separate rites. The confusion which thus arose still

---

[44] *Strom.* II. 3.

[45] *Ep.* 72, 1. Assigned by Ritschl to the year 256 (Krüger, *op. cit.*, p. 296).

[46] *De Baptismo*, c. 7. Anointing with oil was used with both baptism and Confirmation. This chapter comes between the discussions of these two and may refer to either.

[47] *Protrep.* c. 12.

[48] *Apost. Const.* VII. 42. The date is uncertain; it may be the third century, but probably this compilation rests on much earlier sources, and this seventh book is thought to be a recension of the *Didache*, *vide* Krüger, *op. cit.*, pp. 356ff., *cf.* p. 67.

[49] But even here the distinction is not certain.

[50] There is almost no reference to marriage. Tertullian has three treatises, *To his wife*, *An Exhortation to Chastity*, and *On Monogamy*, all of which exalt chastity above marriage, and reflect his Montanist bias.

exists, and is clearly reflected in the doctrines concerning them, as we shall see. Baptism was primarily a rite of purification, supplemented by the additional rite of "inspiration" if we may use that word, which conferred upon the recipient a positive gift of holiness.[51] Confession became a secondary rite of purification and remission of sins, and was closely associated with the Eucharist, for which it served as a preparation. At first it was specific and open, that is the definite confession of particular sins to the whole congregation, from which it passed through several stages of transition[52] till it finally became merely a general confession as part of the Liturgy of the Eucharist, but also evolved into a separate and specific *private* confession besides. Ordination, or the Sacrament of Holy Order, has not clearly appeared as a rite up to the point to which our study has brought us, but the administrative and official duties of the clergy have clear-

---

[51] Immortality would seem to have been associated with this gift of the Holy Spirit, rather than with the purification, if we may distinguish between the two elements of the rite.

[52] *Tertullian* (*De Poenit.* 9 *et al*) speaks of confession as though it were public; cf. *De Bap.* 20; Iranaeus *Adv. Haeres.* I 13, 5; *Apost. Canons* 52. The declarative form of absolution, used in the West only, dates from the 13th cent. Clem. Alex. speaks of the priest judging who is worthy to receive absolution (*Strom.* I. 1) and the first suggestion of "indulgence" appears in Cyprian (*Ep.* 11). Basil (*Ep.* 199) treats of those sins *not* publicly confessed, showing the beginning of the office of "penitentiary" which began after the Decian persecution, but was abolished during the fifth century, cf. Solomon, *Eccl. Hist.*, VII. 16. The transition from public to private confession was not completed till the 12th century, though it began in the West as early as the middle of the fifth. (Leo I., *Epis. ad Episcop.*, quoted in Bingham, *Antiq.*, VIII. lii. 4, and Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* Bk. VI.)

On the history of Confession *vide* Marshall, N., *The Penitential Discipline in the Primitive Church* (Oxford, 1844), Roberts, C. M., *A Treatise on the Hist. of Confession* (Lond., 1901), Bickersteth, Cyril, *The Ministry of Absolution* (N. Y., 1912).

ly appeared.[53] Such an official ministry was essential to the preservation of the Church, and given the Pentecostal experience and the previous Institution of the Eucharistic rite, and some rite of ordination *must* follow. Unction and Matrimony we have found mentioned, here and there, yet still in a nebulous condition which seems to suggest that they are still in the process of "becoming." This is a tempting subject for speculation, but we must try to confine ourselves to a dispassionate and impartial enumeration of the facts as we find them.

Were one to launch out into speculation, one question that immediately occurs to press for an answer is why the two rites connected with the purification of women after childbirth and with burial, never came to be exalted to the grade of sacraments. If primitive practice is to be any guide to us in forming a conclusion as to the real *value* of the Sacraments, surely we should expect these two rites, so closely connected with the two great mysteries of life and death to have been among those rites which the Christian Church would have esteemed most highly. And yet, *mirabile dictu,* such is not the case![54]

In the passage from Clement of Alexandria, to which we just referred,[55] he draws a parallel between the pagan Mysteries and the sacred mysteries of the Church, which is almost the first instance we find of the acceptance of this analogy. He says, in part:

---

[53] *e. g.*, Clem. Alex., *Paed.* III. 12; *Strom.* VI. 13; Ignatius, *Ad Smyr.* 8; *Apost. Const. VII.* 42 and 43.

[54] These ceremonies occupy important positions in the whole series considered as stages of transition in human life, on the theory advanced by van Gennep. (*Rites de passage.*) But some influence prevented them from *holding* this position in the Christian system. Was it the emphasis on the *soul* rather than the body, and the conviction that life and death were subject to immutable laws?

[55] *Protrep.* c. 12.

"Then thou shalt see my God and be initiated into the sacred mysteries, and come to the fruition of those things which are laid up in heaven. * * I will show you the Lord and the mysteries of the Word, expounding them after thine own fashion. * * O truly sacred mysteries, O stainless light! My way is lighted with torches, and I survey the heavens and God; I become holy whilst I am initiated. The Lord is the hierophant and seals with illumination him who is initiated, and presents to the Father him who believes, to be kept safe forever. Such are the reveries of my mysteries."

Bitter though the Conflict was between the Christian faith and the pagan Mysteries, Clement admits that there are many suggestions of resemblance. Earlier in this same treatise he has declared that the Mysteries were the "prime authors of evil" [56] and Justin had attributed these resemblances to devils.[57] How are we to explain this apparent contradiction? With the *morality,* or rather immorality, of the Mysteries, as it appeared to the Christians, they could have no parley, but the ideas which underlay their religious rites were similar, and the elemental human nature to which both appealed was one.

Farnell suggests that the ideas which the Christian rites presented were *new,* in a sense, but not alien to the Mediterranean world, and this kinship facilitated the propagation of Christianity from the start.[58] It was the presence of the Oriental and Greek Mysteries that was responsible for this.

It may be seriously doubted whether the confidence in the possibility of a real communion with God, the conviction of an assured immortality, for which the world longed so intensely at the time, could ever have been meditated to it by the Christian religion, had it not found its expression through

[56] *Protrep.* c. 2.

[57] *Apol.* I. 66; cf. *Dial.* 70.

[58] *Hibbert Journal* II. (1903-1904), p. 307. *vide supra* p. 111, n. 28.

these very Sacramental rites which many people have come to think are superstitious and "magical" and a relic of barbarism that should disappear before the onward sweep of an intelligent civilization.[59]

[59] *cf.* H. G. Wood, "Baptism in Hasting's *Encyc. of Relig. & Ethics*, I. p. 397. *.cf. infra* p. 216 end and n. 14.

XI

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS

The whole course of our study of religious rites has tended, it seems to me, to show that doctrine is wholly secondary and subsequent to rites in the history of the development of religion, and our interest in the doctrines which come to be associated with any rite are, for this reason, wholly subordinate to our main interest in the function of the rite itself. But since the popular impression is usually that doctrine is the primary and important thing, particularly in the Christian religion, it is necessary for us to make a brief survey of the changes that have taken place in the doctrine of the Sacraments, or more accurately speaking, in their theological interpretation.

Sacramental doctrine has never, in the strictest sense of the word, taken a place in the formulation of that doctrine which was *de fide,* but it has occupied a prominent place in the history of theological polemics. It would be outside the purpose of our study to attempt to make a comprehensive statement of these numerous differences of opinion, but it is important to our contention that we should emphasize the fact that they *have* taken place, and that the history of the doctrinal side of the sacramental system of the Christian church is a history of *incessant change.* The number of the Sacraments was finally fixed at seven by the Council of Florence, during those troublous days when the Roman church was vainly endeavoring to silence the clamor for reformation and stifle the growing spirit of revolt, and Transubstantiation had received the sanction of Innocent II. and the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, but during no time

previous to this had there been any such unanimity of opinion as the Vincentian Canon of catholic truth would require. The *use* of the sacred rites of baptism, the Eucharist and anointing with oil, either at baptism or subsequently, had been and continued to be found "everywhere, always and by all," and to these were added other sacred rites, but which of them should be esteemed "sacraments" and what should be believed about their effects and the way in which these were wrought, these things were, from the very first, matters of uncertainty and dispute.

We have already seen that the use of ceremonies springs from the need of the social life of a group to find some expression for the single spirit which animates it, and further that as the sense of oneness is weakened, or a doubt as to the purpose and significance of the ceremony arises, two things result: first there is a renewal of emphasis on the ceremony itself, and insistence on its necessity to renew and strengthen the weakened sense of "participation," and then, subsequently, there appear elaborate explanations of the origin of the ceremony and the purposes it is intended to fulfil, which elevate it to the grade of a sacred rite. As the Christian church is not peculiar in the use of sacred rites, so it is not peculiar in the elaboration of "doctrinal" explanations of them, and we shall find that as disputes and conflicts arose, each lent something in its turn to the interpretation of the Church's rites.

In the last chapter we found that down to the middle of the third century but three of the seven rites which were finally called sacraments appear to have firmly established themselves in the position of primary importance, though the others are not without mention. We must now attempt to discover the way in which these seven came into this one classification, but as it is manifestly impossible, within the limits imposed upon our study, to consider them all in detail, we will do well to devote our attention chiefly to the first

three. The process by which the others came to be classed with these three, is much the same as that by which the Nicene Creed, as we know it today, grew out of the original creed of the Council of Nicea, which ended with the words "I believe in the Holy Ghost." The life of the Church found a need which was forthwith supplied, but the steps of the process are not left on record.

Duschene begins his work on Christian Worship [1] with the statement that Christianity sprang out of Judaism, but this does not tell all that there is to tell about it. While undoubtedly true, it is also true that Christianity did not long remain a Jewish sect, but passed from Antioch out into the Mediterranean world to take its place along side of other religions preaching redemption, and after a fierce conflict lasting over three hundred years, drove them all from the field. Jewish were baptism and the Lord's Supper, possibly, in their inception, but when they appear in the New Testament, after the lapse of some forty years, at the least, and when we find them in subsequent Christian literature, they are no longer *wholly* Jewish, but have taken on the spirit of the Mysteries.[2] The terminology of the Greek Mysteries seems to have passed over into Christian writings even with St. Paul, and the evidence points to the adoption of the conceptions as well as the language, with scarcely any change. "That such ideas should emerge in the Christian community is natural enough, when we consider its environment—a world without natural science, steeped in belief in every kind of magic and enchantment, and full of public and private

---

[1] This is the title of the English translation of his *Origines du Culte Cretien* (London, 1912), published by the S. P. C. K.

[2] "Der ganze Apparat der Mysterienterminologie ist in die Praxis und noch mehr in die Theorie der Kirche eingedrungen." (Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 224.)

religious societies, every one of which had its mysteries and miracles and its blood-bond with its peculiar deity." [3]

The Didache is sometimes appealed to as representing the earliest and "purest" conception of the Eucharist, free from any of the terminology of the Mysteries, because of the prayer:

> "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and gathered together became one, so let Thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom, for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever." [4]

But there is no reason to believe that this prayer represented the *whole* of the liturgy, since it is spoken of as a "thanksgiving" a term which applied to a particular part of the liturgy, as well as to the whole rite (Eucharist), and furthermore, the Didache is believed to have been *originally* a purely Jewish catechism for proselytes which was "adapted" to Christian use. This would account, to some extent, for its brief form, as well as for the clearly Jewish type of expression.[5] But even the Didache is not unfamiliar with the Mysteries, since it contains an enigmatic reference to a "cosmic mystery" in its eleventh chapter.[6]

---

[3] Glover, *op. cit.*, p. 158. On the introduction of the terminology of the Mysteries, and references to its use, *vide* Hatch, E., *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church* (London, 1907), p. 296 ff.

[4] *Didache* X. 4.

[5] The present form of the text is supposed to have originated in Syria, about 150 A. D., by additions to the earlier "adapted" form. cf. Krüger, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67. On the Didache *vide* Schaff, P., *The Oldest Church Manual* (N. Y. 2nd ed., 1886), esp. p. 190 ff. This passage is enlarged in the seventh Book of the Apostolic Constitutions.

[6] Schaff translates the passage: And every approved genuine prophet, who makes assemblies for a worldly mystery, etc. The

Whatever may have been the intention of this term "cosmic mystery," one thing is certain, the prevalence of astrology in the first century of our era was a much more potent factor in influencing popular thought than is now generally realized, and "the polemics of the Fathers of the Syrian

---

text is Πᾶς δὲ προφήτης δεδοκιμασμένος ἀληθινὸς ποιῶν εἰς μυστήριον κοσμικὸν εκκλησίας κ.τ.λ., and it has puzzled the commentators no little. Schaff gives about a dozen different attempts at translation. But is it so difficult to understand what a "cosmic mystery" may be, after our survey of the oriental mysteries which must have been familiar in Egypt and Syria when the Didache took its present form? The Syrian Goddess was a nature deity, mistress of fertility, and Robertson Smith has given us a minute description of the local Syrian "Baals." In Egypt the sacred rites of Isis had an intimate relation with the yearly overflow of the life-giving waters of the Nile. And we have mentioned that the Syrian Goddess brought in her train the Chaldean sooth-sayers and astrologers, who taught that everything was governed by the action of the stars. It seems hardly necessary to search for some "secular" or "worldly' meaning with which to discern the sense of this passage in the Didache, when the simplest and quite the most obvious meaning is supported by all the evidence of the pagan mysteries. It is those "cosmic mysteries" which claim to control or influence the course of *nature*, the governance of which our Heavenly Father holds in the hollow of His hand, which are not to be countenanced by the Christians, and the prophet who tries to assemble the church for *such* mysteries will receive his punishment from God. But let us note that if this be the correct interpretation of this passage, we have here, by inference at least, *consent* to the presence of some *other* mysteries, not mentioned.

In this connection I may refer to van Gennep, who says that the final application of the theory of "rites of passage" is in relating the various stages of human life, by a sort of prescientific divination, to the grand rhythm of the universe; (*op. cit.*, p. 279); and to Frazer, who says that when there is a periodic time for public purification, such as the Jewish Atonement, it usually occurs at one of the transitions between seasons, or at the beginning of a new year, civic, religious or solar. (*G. B.*, IX. 224-225).

Church show how considerable its prestige was" [7] even in the Christian community. Harnack thinks that the resistance offered to it by the Church is to be considered "a great achievement" and yet it was not wholly eradicated, for though it was attacked as pagan in the second century, it "raised its head within the church in the third, had to be sharply refuted in the fourth, but after the third century the 'theologians' no longer controlled the Christian community and could not prevent its 'filtering in.'" [8] But it may be questioned whether the theologians were themselves wholly free from some taint of its influence. The Dominican editors of the English translation of the *Summa* of St. Thomas, which is being issued but is not yet complete, thought it necessary to comment, in their introduction, on the evidence of astrological conceptions in his work, and they are forced to admit that "in one department of Science, however, it cannot be denied that St. Thomas is 'behind the age.'" This is in astronomy, but they explain that he labored under the limitations of his time, and speaks only as an "educated gentleman of his day." [9] While it is true "that St. Thomas frequently refers to the ruling of the 'heavenly bodies' in human affairs" this is explained as meaning that the stars exercised their influence "in agreement with other laws, and in subordination to all superior laws; above all in absolute subjection to the supreme and absolute Will of God." [10] For over twelve centuries this idea that the movements of the planets had a direct influence on the progress of human affairs, dominated the thought of the civilized world, and it

[7] Cumont, *Orien. Religs.*, p. 251, n. 57 end.

[8] Harnack, *Miss. and Expan. of Xty.*, I. p. 316 no. 1.

[9] Part I. 1st Number, p. lxxx., Bensiger Bros. (N. Y., 1911).

[10] *ut supra.* This is deduced from Pars. I., Q. 18, Art. I., ad 1: "Motus coeli est in universo corporalium naturam sicut motis cordis in animali quo conservatur vita." But this sounds much more like the Stoic doctrine of the universe being "one animal."

would not be strange if we found that it had left its lasting impress on Christian "doctrine." [11] The seven planets have had a curious history. Plato thought them divine living bodies, and subsequent philosophers speculated more concerning them, the doctrine of their spheres finding its Greek beginning, no doubt, in the purely astronomical speculations of Eudoxus, who introduced the hypothesis of *three* concentric

[11] The conception that the soul returned, after death, to the heavenly spheres spread over the Occident towards the end of the republic and was generally accepted towards the end of the empire, when the abode of the dead, "the Elysian fields" which the votaries of Isis and Serapis still located in the depths of the earth, was transferred to the sphere of the fixed stars or some other heavenly realm. *cf. Cumont, Orien. Religs.*, pp. 125 ff., esp. 253 n. 64 *et seq.*, 284 n. 19, 286 n. 25; *Astrol. and Relig.*, esp. chap. 3.

Cumont insists that the idea that the soul returns to its home above the stars originated in Babylon, to which Anz traces also Gnosticism (in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XV. 4, Leipzig, 1897), but as I have already said, Moulton connects the doctrine that the plants were *malevolent* with the Magi.

The early Zoroastrian system associated the "wandering stars" with Ahriman, the Prince of Evil, and assigned one of these as the antagonist to each of the great fixed stars of the four directions. (*Bundahis* 5:1). The wanderings of the planets seemed to be an element of disorder in the heavens, and this would probably account for their being looked upon as inhabited by evil spirits. Moulton thinks that this element of astrology was brought to the Avesta by the Magi, who were "strangers alike to Aryan and to Semite." Later the old names for the planets were displaced by names borrowed from Babylonian star worship, and we have the startling incongruity in the Avesta that the *names* given to the planets are those of the Yazatas, the "imperishable ones" or divine beings associated with the god of Good, while their *character* shows their connection with the powers of Evil. (*cf. Early Zoroastrianism*, pp. 211 ff.).

The names for the planets, including the sun and moon in the ancient category, are borrowed from the Semitic star worship. Of the peculiar history through which these names have passed, Cumont says: "When the Greeks learned to recognize the five

heavenly spheres, each of which was material, in our sense of the word, and each revolving at a different rate, to account for the cycle of the eclipses. It was not only in the "spiritual" sense that the planets had "spheres of influence," for the Greek astronomers at least, for Aristotle extended the hypothesis of Eudoxus, and added a number of compensating spheres to avoid the possibility of interference in this elaborate mechanism which was intended to account for the periodic motions of the heavenly bodies, and Aristotle had each planet fastened to its sphere so that it would revolve with it. This is the beginning of the Ptolemaic astronomy, which continued to be the conception of "an educated gentleman" of Thomas Aquinas' day, and it followed the Pythagorean tradition that there were *seven* planets, including the sun and moon of course, and they all revolved round the earth.

Prof. Murray, writing of the evolution of Greek religion, says:[12] "Astrology fell upon the Hellenistic mind as a new

---

planets known to antiquity, they gave them names derived *from their character.* * * * After the fourth century (however) other titles are found to supersede these ancient names, which are gradually ousted from use. The planets became the stars of Hermes, Aphrodite, Ares, Zeus, Kronos. Now this seems due to the fact that in Babylonia these same planets were dedicated to Nebo, Ishtar, Nergal, Marduk, and Ninib. * * * Thus the names of the planets which *we* employ to-day, are an English translation of a Latin translation of a Greek translation of Babylonian nomenclature." (*Astrol. and Relig.*, pp. 45-46; italics mine.)

[12] Murray, Gilbert, *Four Stages of Greek Religion* (N. Y., 1912), p. 120 ff. The planets were not only considered Elements in the Kosmos, *Stoicheia*, but this same word had long been used for the Greek A B C, particularly for the seven vowels α ε η ι ο υ ω. "This is no chance, no mere coincidence. The vowels are the mystic signs of the planets. Hence strange prayers and magic formula innumerable." (*ibid.*) *cf.* Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*,

disease falls upon some remote island people. Every one was ready to receive the germ. The Epicureans, of course, held out, and so did Panaetius, the coolest head among the Stoics. But the Stoics as a whole gave way. They formed with good reason the leading school of philosophy, and it would have been a service to mankind if they had resisted. But they were already committed to a belief in the deity of the stars and to the doctrine of Heimarmenê, or Destiny. They believed in the pervading Pronoai, or Forethought, of the divine mind, and in the Συμπάθεια τῶν ὅλων—the Sympathy of all Creation,[13] so that whatever happens to any part, however remote or insignificant, affects all the rest. It seemed only a natural and beautiful illustration of this Sympathy that the movements of the Stars should be bound up with the sufferings of man. * * *

"The various Hermetic and Mithrais communities, the Naassenes described by Hippolytus[14] and other Gnostic bodies, authors like Macrobius and even Cicero in his *Somnium Scipionis,* are full of the influence of the seven planets and of the longing to escape beyond them."

Now it seems to me that in all this complex of interests and ideas associated with the influence of the *seven* planets, we have just the background in experience which any scientific theory of the origin of the number *seven* for the Sacraments would demand. I know that the reply is likely to be

pp. 121 ff.; Reitzenstein, *Mysterienrelgionen,* pp. 20 ff.; *Poimandres,* Stud. zur Greichish-egyptischen u. frühChrist, Lit., Leip. 1904. pp. 226 ff.; Apuleius, *Metam.* XI.

For a discussion of the planetary spheres in Porphyry and the Neoplatonists, *vide* Wendland, *op. cit.* pp. 172 ff. "Der Grundrisz dieser Lehre ist heidenisch * * * Durch Umformungen, Erweiterungen, Eintragungen konnte diese Lehre mit dem Stoffe christlicher und anderer Religionen bereichert werden." (p. 175).

[13] Cicero, *De Nat. Deo.* III. 11, 28; esp. *De Divina.,* ii. 14, 34; 60, 124; 69, 142.

[14] *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* V. 7.

the obvious one, that seven is a "sacred" number,[15] but this would only change the form of our question to *why* the number *seven* is more sacred than five or eight, numbers which have both been given as including the Sacraments during the course through which the "doctrine" associated with them has passed.

Gnosticism, with which the Christian teachers, even in St. Paul's day, had to contend, furnishes the connecting link, between the astrological doctrine of Fate, ruled by the planets, and immortality conferred through the sacraments, by connecting the planetary spheres with *sin*.

For the sake of convenience, I take the Gnostic doctrine of the planetary spheres from the Hermetic literature, for whatever else it may have been, Hermeticism was certainly Gnostic.[16] In the treatist known as *Poimandres,* the most

---

[15] Much has been written on this subject of "sacred numbers." We cannot pause here to discuss it, but only to insist that there must have been some *reason* why any number came to be thought sacred. It is not enough to trace the use of the concept back to its supposed origin, for this gives us no better understanding of the reason of it all, than the argument for a "first cause." Here is a perfectly intelligible explanation of the reason *why* seven was thought such a sacred number: *because* the planets ruled the destiny of man and *there were seven* so-called planets.

M. Levy-Bruhl has some very sensible remarks on the danger of taking any *one* criterion of judgment in trying to discover the origin of sacred numbers, among which is this: "elle ne se représente donc les directions de l'espace, les points cardineaux et leur nombre que dans un complexus mystique auquel le nombre quatre doit son caractère de catégorie, non logique, mais mystique.' (*op cit.* p. 246.)

[16] *cf.* Case, *op. cit.*, p. 328, where references to some of the literature on the Hermetic books are given. Besides those there mentioned *vide* Kroll, W., "Hermes Trismegistos" in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie* (Stuttgart, 1912), XV., col. 792 ff.; Creed, J. M., "The Hermetic Writings," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, XV (1914), p. 513 ff.; Granger, "The Poemandres of

important document of the Hermetic *corpus,* the ninth chapter begins with the following:

> "And God-the-Mind (Νοῦς), being male and female both, as Light and Life subsisting, brought forth another Mind to give things form, who, God as he was of Fire and Spirit, formed Seven Rulers who enclose the Cosmos that the sense perceives. Men call their ruling Fate (εἱμαρμένη)." [17]

At the end of the book (chaps. 24-26) there follows a description of death and dissolution, in answer to the disciples' question concerning "the nature of the Way Above," in which it is said that "the body's senses next pass back into their sources, becoming separate, and resurrect as energies; and passion and desire withdraw into that nature which is void of reason." Then follows the journey onward through the Harmony, the region of the Fate which dwells in the heavenly spheres, and to each of these seven "zones" the soul surrenders some "energy" or desire which has bound it down to earth and mortality, and finally emerges in the Father's home, freed from all contamination of "earthly soul." [18]

Hermes Trismegistus," *ibid.* V. (1904), pp. 395 ff.; VIII. (1907), pp. 635 ff.; Bardy, G., in *Revue Biblique*, VIII. (1911), pp. 391 ff.

[17] Mead's translation. Mead has a long note to prove that the Hermetic theory of the "spheres" does *not* apply to the *physical* planets. (*Thrice Greatest Hermes*, London, 1906, 3 vols., III. p. 299.)

[18] *cf. Poem.*, IV. 8: "Thou see'st, son, how many are the bodies through which we have to pass, how many are the choirs of daimones, how vast the system of star-courses (through which our path doth lie), to hasten to the One and Only God. For to the Good there is no other shore; It hath no bounds; It is without an end; and for Itself It is without beginning, too, though unto us it *seemeth* to have one—the Gnosis." It is in this treatise, or chapter, which Mead calls "The Cup or Monad" that the interesting description of the disciple as "contemplator" oc-

The most prominent element in all this doctrine is the emphasis on the contamination of the naturally immortal soul, and the taking upon itself of passions and desires in the passage from heaven to earth, through the seven spheres of the planets, and again its gradual divesting of itself, and the rejection of this mortal taint by seven stages on the return journey to its abode in the eighth or highest heaven *above* the stars. The Gnostic writings consist largely of charms and mystic formulae which were to be uttered by the soul to each of the planets in turn as it pursued this perilous path.[19]

In an obscure passage in his controversy with Marcion the Gnostic, Tertullian mentions *seven* "deadly sins" [20] and the conclusion seems to me irresistable that we have here a very clear indication of the reason he enumerates just this num-

---

curs (IV.2). The text has θεατής, and Lactantius, speaking of man as the only animal that looks up toward his Creator, says: "And this 'looking' Hermes has most rightly named contemplation (θεοπτίαν)." (*Inst.* vii. 9.) Apparently by the interchange of θεωρίαν for θεοπτίαν the title "Theoretics" became associated with the disciples of Hermes, and is mentioned by Justin among the most famous schools of philosophers. (*Dial. c. Tryph.* 218). Justin also mentions Hermes in his *Cohortatio ad Gentiles* (c. 38) and there are also references in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* I. xxi. 134; VI. iv. 35; *Protrep.* II. 29) and in Cyril of Alexandria (I. 30-35). We have here a range of reference in Christian writers covering about three hundred years.

It is interesting, in the light of our discussion, to find Wendland expressing this opinion of the *significance* of Gnosticism: "Die gnostischen Religionen sind die Reaktion gegen die Astralreligion, die des Menschen Schicksal unter die Gewalt der Sterngötter stellt." (*op. cit.*, p. 176.)

[19] The idea that a divine guide conducted the soul along this heavenly way was found in the Mithraic Mysteries, and also in those of the Syrian cults. *vide Orien. Religs.*, pp. 260-261, and 253 n. 63; also *Texts et Mon.*, I. 310. The idea of Newman's *Dream of Gerontius* is very similar.

[20] *Adv. Marcion* IV. 9. They are "idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, fornication, false-witness and fraud."

ber and no other, making a very unsatisfactory and illogical classification *to fit the required number*. The doctrine of the seven "cardinal sins" which seems, so far as I have been able to discover, to emerge here, is the Christian substitute for the seven planetary spheres of the Gnostics. It is hardly necessary to enlarge upon this evident parallelism, but the *whole* of sin and impurity was comprehended within the rather indefinite Gnostic division into seven spheres, and the *cardinal* sins, as they were afterwards "rationalized" were the seven "pivotal" (*cardo* pivot or hinge) on which all others hang, and from which they may logically be derived.[21]

The suggestion I have to make is that the number of the Sacraments was finally settled as seven because the number was already associated with the number of "deadly sins." It has never been possible to establish a strict parallelism between the two series, but in theory, at least, the suggestion that if there are seven types of sin there should be seven kinds of sacraments to remove them and supply the immortality which salvation requires, would seem to me to offer a working "hypothesis" as to the underlying cause for the eventual decision that there are and should be but seven sacraments.

The most powerful factor in establishing a *doctrine* of the Sacraments was St. Augustine, and yet he "did not evolve a harmonious theory either of the number or notion of (them)." [22] He mentions five, or perhaps six, of the seven

[21] This classification was not at once accepted. Cyprian, perhaps fifty years later enumerates *eight* (*De Mortal.* 4), which number is given by Cassian about two hundred years later (*De Instit. Coenab.*, V. 5) and by Alcuin toward the end of the eighth century (*De virtute et vitiis*, xxvii, ff.). But it finds place in the *Moralia* of Gregory the Great (xxxi. 17) and finally in Thomas Aquinas' *Summa* (I. 1., Q. 84 ad 4) and prevails. Evidently from this we may suppose a divergence of tradition between East and West.

[22] Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, V. p. 156.

rites and speaks of them as sacraments, but leaves us to infer that *any* material sign with which the conferring of salvation is associated through "the Word" is sacramental.[23] Here we see that even after eight hundred years the number has not been definitely settled, though we have reached the beginning of the process of classification which finally ended in "definition." Hugo of St. Victor, writing on the Sacraments, distinguishes *six*,[24] but in his "sentences" where he follows the ancient Fathers, he enumerates but *five*, Bap-

---

[23] *In Joan.* Tract 80, 3, "Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum, etiam ipsum tamquam visibile verbum. *cf. Contra Faustum*, XIX. 19. In *Enchirid.* 46, he speaks of the remission of post-baptismal sin without calling penance a sacrament, though it evidently is intended.

The Western definition of a sacrament as "signum visibile gratiae invisibilis" (*Catechism of Council of Trent, II.* n. 4) rests on St. Augustine's "Signacula quidem rerum divinarum esse visibilia, sed res ipsas invisibiles in eis honorari" (*De Catech. rudibus*, 50). *cf.* Thomas Aquinas, *Summa* "solum ea quae significant perfectionem sanctitatis humanae." (III. Q. 60, ii. *ad.* 3).

In passing we may call attention to Harnack's note: "Doctrine is, strictly speaking, inaccurate; for Catholicism does not know any 'doctrines' here, but describes an actual state of matter brought about by God." (*ut supra*, V. 143 n. 1).

Tertullian has a passage in which the apparent intent is to enumerate the sacred rites, from which we may infer that he recognized *five*: "The flesh, indeed is washed, in order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed, that the soul too may be fortified; the flesh is shadowed with the imposition of hands, that the soul also may be illuminated by the Spirit; the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul likewise may fatten on its God." *De Resur.* 8. But here we can distinguish but *three* of the seven Sacraments.

[24] *De Sac.*, Bk. II pt. 6 ff. Orders are discussed in II. 3 but not *called* a sacrament.

tism, the Eucharist, Confirmation, Unction and Marriage.[25] The first clear enunciation of the doctrine of seven sacraments appears in the Sentences of Master Roland, afterward Pope Alexander III [26] (1159-1181), and then in Peter Lombard, the "Master of Sentences," [27] since whose time it has become a part of Catholic theology, a process which took almost exactly eleven hundred years!

As might be supposed, since the number of the Sacraments was not strictly *limited* except after a long period of constant *use* in the religious life of Christians, so the theoretical explanation of their value did not at once take definite shape. The spirit which led to the development of a "doctrine" of the Sacraments was the same that led to the final limitation of their number. It was the philosophic spirit, which gradually transformed the emphasis from the *use* of the sacred rites of the Church to the holding of a definite body of orthodox doctrine. We must be satisfied with the mere mention of some of the most significant incidents in this development.

First, then, as to the *background*. The Mystery religions and Neoplatonism have both been mentioned already. So has the growing spirit of individualism, but a word needs to be added on the importance of this, for the *individual's* ex-

---

[25] *Summa senten., tr.* 5-7, *apud* Harnack, *op. cit.*, VI. 202, who says that Robert Pullus also counts *five* (*Senten.*, V. 22-24; VII. 14) but substitutes confession and ordination for unction and marriage. Here then, in the Schoolmen, we find the seven coming into their final position of supremacy.

[26] *apud* Harnack, *ut supra.*

[27] Sent. IV., *dist.* 2 A. (*apud Catholic Encyclopedia, in loco* "Sacrament." This authority says that Otto of Bamberg is "said to be the first" to enumerate seven sacraments, but Harnack thinks that Hahne has disproved this. *cf. Hist. Dog.*, VI. 202.)

For further references to the use of the word sacrament, and their being the "means of grace" *vide* Harnack, *op. cit.*, II. 138 n. 1; pp. 138-148.

perience took on a new significance in Christianity.[28] Not only did the social breakup of the Roman Empire before the Gothic hordes under Alaric provoke St. Augustine to look beyond this earth for the "abiding City" [29] but it forced the individual Christian to realize that things, in reality, did not correspond to the blessed condition which the Gospel represented. As Christian *experience* could not substantiate the promises of the Gospel here, it had to fall back on the *promises* only, and the *hope* that in the world *to come,* they might be realized. Doctrine *did not agree with experience,* but because this was an evil and sin-stained world, the religious man, in his extremity, then, as always, persisted in the *hope,* and as the hope became the all-important thing, the exposition of the grounds of this hope (theology) and the clinging to it in the face of suffering and persecution, the "holding fast the Faith" (doctrine) became, as they had *not* always been, the primary things.

It is important to realize that here we have an exact parallel to the development of the formal rite out of the earlier and more spontaneous group ceremonial, with its accompanying change of interpretation of the ceremony and the transition from a pure myth to the aetiological myth and pure tradition. The steps in the change are roughly these: first a gradual change in the interpretation of the established rites, to conform to growing knowledge and advance in culture; next logically, though chronologically probably contemporaneous, a gradual transition in the concepts of the being or object of worship and the purpose and effects of the rite—the rite itself remaining practically *unchanged;* and

---

[28] In what immediately follows I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness again, and more specifically to Prof. George H. Mead.

[29] *De Civitatis Dei* is so thoroughly imbued with the modern spirit of "experience" and the importance of the individual, that it may be taken as a *terminus a quo* for the "modern era."

finally, the reaction of these changed conceptions on the rite itself, and its gradual modification accordingly, to fit the new situation.[30]

This doctrinal transition came first with the transfer, in the Donatist controversy, of the emphasis from a pure life to the holding of the Catholic Faith. It centered round the *correct use of the rite,* and ended in the *traditio symboli,* which we have seen was an integral part of the Mysteries, becoming the teaching of the Creed. The profession of faith became the contract of membership.[31] The outcome of this controversy practically fixed the idea of Baptism, and it does not again appear to have come under discussion. The earlier controversy over discipline, in the days of Novatian and Cyprian, when the validity of heretical baptism was in dispute, had left its mark on Catholic doctrine, and brought into prominence the importance of confession, as necessary for the remission of post-baptismal sin.[32] It seems most likely that at about this time, during the Trinitarian dispute that was raging, and in which Novatian wrote one of the

---

[30] This is a brief summary of Hartland's account of the divergence of religion from magic; *cf. Ritual and Belief,* Pt. iv., "Divergence" pp. 128 ff.

[31] *Cf.* Hatch, *op. cit.,* p. 341. *vide etiam* Duchesne, *op. cit.,* pp. 300 ff., (Eng. trans. pp. 301 ff.).

There can be no doubt that the Catholic decision that the efficacy of the sacrament does *not* depend upon the holiness of the minister, was according to facts. In this Dionysius the Areopagite, of whom we must speak later, departs from Catholic tradition, insisting that the rite administered by the holiest is the most potent. (*Eccl. Hier.* III. iii. 14)

The "traditio" is most clearly evident in the Catechical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, and he uses many of the terms borrowed (?) from the Greek Mysteries.

[32] *Cf. supra* p. 166 n. 52. *vide* Cyprian, *Ad Donatum, De Lapsis, Ep.* 67-74.

most important treatises,[33] the use of the Triune name with triple immersion became fixed in Catholic practice, which, if we judge solely from the Acts, had begun with baptism "in the name of the Lord." [34]

The addition of various ceremonies to the rite of Baptism is one of the things against which the Protestants at the time of the Reformaiton, made their strongest protests, claiming that they were no part of the "original institution." It was these that Tertullian justified on the ground of "tradition," and he refers to one ceremony, at least, which is of particular interest because of its relation to the Mysteries. This was the use of milk and honey in the rite of initiation.[35] The use of a mixture of these as a beverage was familiar in the Mysteries, and whether directly *borrowed* by Christianity or not, its significance in the Christian rite was the same.[36] The other instances of similarity between the Chris-

---

[33] This was his *De Trinitate.* "It cannot be questioned that the church had not yet attained to the view of the Person of Christ which belongs to the developed creed of the post-Nicene theology." (Fausset's edition, Cambridge, 1909, *Intro.*, p. xxix.)

[34] The triple form appears in Justin, *Apol.* I. 61; *Didache* VII., 1 and 3; *cf.* Tertul., *De Corona Militis*, in which he incidentally condemns the use of garlands; Basil, *De Spir. Sanc.*, 27, Jerome, *Dial. contra Luc.*, 8.

[35] *Adv. Marcion*, I.14. Duchesne argues that since milk and honey are the type of the "blessed country" in the Old Testament, there is no necessity to look to the pagan Mysteries for the introduction of this ceremony. (*Origines*, p. 335 n. 4, Eng. trans. *Christ. Worsh. ibid.*) This would be quite true if we could discover in the O. T. any *motive* for its introduction.

[36] Sallustius, in *De Deis et Mundo* 4, says: "After that the feeding on milk, as though we were being born again; after which come rejoicings and garlands and, as it were, a return up to the Gods." (Murray's trans., *Four Stages, etc.*, p. 193). cf. Bonner, C., "Dionysiac Magic and the Greek Land of Cockaigne" in *Trans. Amer. Philolog. Ass'n.*, XLI. (1910) pp.175-185.

Schrader (*Encyc. Relig. and Eth.*, II.27, *in loco* "Aryan Religion") notices the universal use among Aryan peoples of honey

tian ceremonies and those of the Mysteries, which *must* have had their effect upon subsequent doctrine, are scattered all through the literature of the Church.[37]

---

in connection with ceremonies of the *dead*. Can it be possible that some early conception concerning the bee, or the mysteriousness of the process of making honey connected it with the dead, and that in the ceremonies of initiation, the use of honey refers to the *death* of the "old man" as milk does to the birth of the "new"?

Tertullian's familiarity with all the "idolatrous" ceremonies connected with child-birth is shown by the passage in *De Anima* 39.

[37] These are too numerous to enumerate, and mention of a few must suffice. The Lupercalia, an ancient feast at Rome, persisted down to the fifth century, when it was abolished by the substitution of a Christian Feast, by Pope Gelasius. (Glover, *op. cit.* p. 9). In this ceremony the *foreheads* of the youths were smeared with the blood of the sacrificed goats. (*vide* Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, pp. 310 ff.,*cf.* Plutarch, *Romulus*, 21; *Caesar* 61.) Tertullian says that "signing" is used in Mithraism (*Praes. Haer.* 40.) but Cheetham doubts his testimony as to the *fact*. (*op. cit.* p. 104.)

The use of water in rites of purification is as old as the Vendidad in the Avestan literature: "When he has washed his hands three times, thou shalt sprinkle with water the fore part of his skull." (Farg. VII. 40). This particular ceremony is part of the "nine nights cleansing" which is thought to underly the strenuous ordeals of Mithraism. Apuleius says: "After he had first prayed to the gods to be gracious to me, he besprinkled me with purest water and cleansed me. (*Metam.* XI. 23). And in the same author we find a clear suggestion of the "chrisom" or white robe of the primitive baptismal rite: "Assume therefore a happier mien, suiting the white robe thou wearest, and follow the procession of the saviour goddess with exultant step." (*ut. supra* XI. 15; *cf.* chap. 23).

There has been much discussion of the term "illuminati" (Φωτισμός) used by Justin for the baptised (*Apol.* I. 61) and taken up by later writers. (*e. g.* Clem. Alex., *Paed.* I. 6; Cyril Jeru., *Catech.* XIII. 21; Greg. Naz. *Orat.* XL.). This is probably a term from Gnosticism (*cf. supra* p. 179 ff.) rather than from the

In the Novatian schism and the Donatist controversy we find that the dispute arises over the *use of the rite* and consequently leads to differences of "doctrine" concerning it. Speculation and theory, having gotten into the arena become the chief combatants. At first heresy is philosophy,[38] but soon philosophy becomes the handmaid of orthodoxy.[39] Fascinating as the study of this process is, we may not pause over it, but must hasten on to its final outcome in Neoplatonism.

This process of "intellectualizing" Christianity was in-

---

rites of the Mysteries. *vide* Reitzenstein, *Mysterienrelig.* p. 106; Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 295 n. 1 and 2; Cheetham, *op. cit.*, p. 143 n. 47).

On the whole subject of the ceremonies connected with initiation, and the significance of the *sequence*, *vide* Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 331, Eng. trans. *ibid.*, pp. 295 ff.; van Gennep, *op. cit. passim;* Reinach, *op. cit.*, esp. "Mysteries"; Goblet d'Alviella, *Int. a l'hist. Gen. des Religs.*, (Bruxelles, 1887) pp. 145-156.

[38]Tertullian calls philosophy the "root of heresy" (*Praes. Haeres.* 7 ff.) yet he uses the arguments of Parmenides and Aristotle to prove the reality of Christ's body against the Docetists, in *De Carne Christi.* Clement of Alexandria gives a summary classification of heresies in *Strom.* VII. 17 end, and Hippolytus attempted to prove that all heresies had drawn their material from heathen philosophers. His *Philosophumena* is a mine of information on early Greek philosophy (*vide* Burnet, J., *Early Greek Philosophy* (Lond. 1892), pp. 132 ff., p. 374.) And the recent discovery of the later books of his *Refutation of all Heresies* finally gave the key to the authorship of the former, which is its first book, (*cf.* Krüger, *op. cit.* p. 333 ff.) Clement shows the term "orthodox" or "orthodoxy" in process of *formation*, though not yet clearly articulated. (*vide Strom.* I. 43, 1 and 45, 6). In St. Thomas' *Summa* we find Aristotle "canonized" as THE Philosopher.

[39] Hatch says: "The second century was one of conflicting ideas. Greek philosophical thinking attaches itself to the faith, and is opposed by the older ideas. The result is a compromise, in which the conservatives disappear, having accepted the 'tendency to speculate.' Those who cling to the older non-philosophical view become the 'first heretics,' Ebionites, Nazaraeans, etc." (*op. cit.*, pp. 130-134).

evitable and it is endless. We are today in the midst of the same process, which is always opposed as being a "novelty" and yet is never new because eternal. The earliest Greek mythology preceded the beginnings of that new scepticism which rested on experience. Mythology, at least in its classic form, was itself a sort of intellectual system, which appealed to reason, but did not criticise its own *premises.* These had come down with the *cultus* out of the prehistoric past. Greek philosophy began by appealing to life experience and proceeded to criticize the explanations offered by mythology, but continued to accept its *premises* as "ultimate." It was not till an incipient science appeared, with its new emphasis on the experience of the individual observer, that the technique of criticising premises was developed. But the attack of science was so determined and so powerful, laying its violent hands, as it did, on the most treasured possession of mankind, and attempting to disprove the very existence of the gods, that the moral and religious needs of man provoked him to revolt against the conclusions of science, and casting reason to the winds to fall back on the consolations offered by the Mysteries.

This marked the end of the first period of transition, and resulted in a change of front on the part of philosophy itself. As we have said, philosophy became "a way of life," and *this,* at least, it was insisted, must rest on *reason.* The Stoic "Logos" was the "soul" of the universe, and dwelt in the hearts of *all* men; Plato's ideal "wise man" became the "man in the street" of the Stoics. But the ideal man of Pythagoras had been nurtured by the "mystic communion" of the Oriental Mysteries, as well as on the "fruit of reason" and the Neoplatonist philosopher became a Mystic. For it was through the union of reason with emotion, as represented by philosophy and the Mysteries, that Neoplatonism was born. Of course there was conflict and many vagaries developed, of which the *Auction of Lives* of Lucian and the

miracle mongering of Apollonius of Tyanna give us a glimpse, but Neoplatonism won the day and dominated the philosophical thought of Christendom, till Bacon signalled the beginning of another reaction which found its climax in the scepticism of Hume.

And so the cycles repeat themselves, from superstition to sophistication, and then by a sort of Nemesis, back again from one extreme to the other. Did not Romanticism follow close on the steps of the "Aufklärung" and have we not had in our own day the revolt of Christian Science against "Liberal" Protestantism?

Epicureans and Stoics both denied, in theory at least, the possibility of a resurrection and a *future* life, while the Mysteries and Christianity promised immortality. Christianity today is being forced, slowly but surely to come back to earth from that haven of rest in the heavens, which was for St. Augustine the only abiding city. Pragmatism, wherever it has a quarrel with Idealism, appeals to *experience,* and modern psychology, ignoring the "soul" as an intellectual figment, refers all our mental life to the practical needs of the body, and to a "natural" desire for the preservation and enrichment of life *here and now.* Plato put the world of *reality* beyond the heavens so long ago that we have forgotten that it was *not always there.* And Plato made another significant change when he thought of God as infinite and *un*limited, because to him a *limit* seemed to be a negation of perfection. But for the earlier Greek thought, for the philosophers before Plato, boundlessness or the lack of *some* definite limits meant *unreality* and suggested that background of "not-being" out of which all things came into being. And if we were absolutely honest with ourselves, should we not have to admit that for us it is the same? But Plato had the advantage of a stock of "stuff" out of which *things* could be *made,* and for him it was being only, pure being which

was immaterial and without limit.[40] This conception passed straight into Deism, and the Theistic controversialists of the eighteenth century accepted the Deist's *premises* and fought him on his own ground. As a matter of fact, this particular premise has *never* been criticised in Christian theology and the half-hearted attempts to argue for a "divine immanence" *as well,* indicate that the advocates of "immanence" themselves accept it too. It is because science has discovered that the life process appears to have gone on unhindered from the first protozoa to man, the highest vertebrate, that Christianity has been forced, in spite of this old tradition, and against its will, to concede that God is found working *within* the *material* elements of his world at all, though it has always taught that He is at work in the hearts of men. 'Twas ever thus; for the objection to the Copernican view of the universe was not that it made the earth revolve round the sun: that was a merely secondary matter. The trouble was that it robbed the heavenly bodies of their "heavenly quality," which theology had fastened upon them out of the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, and made them into ponderable masses of matter, subject to *earthly laws!* But before the relentless *facts,* demonstrable beyond a peradventure, theology quietly submitted to Kepler and Newton, though it had hounded Galileo to death, and to-day theology is again rebelling against biology and adapting itself to the doctrine of evolution at one and the same time.

Protagorus suggested the only solution: theory must be adjusted to facts, as the experience of the individual finds them to be, and after all, "man is the measure of all things"—at least in so far as his *judgment* of them is concerned. But

---

[40] Proclus seems to have been the first to suggest that God created the universe out of *nothing,* for he made even *matter* proceed from God. ἡ μεν γαρ ὕλη, ὑποκείμενον οὖσα πάντων, εχ τοῦ πάντων ἀιτίου προῆλθε· (*Stoich. Theol.* 72).

let us not forget that the courageous dictum of Descartes *"Cogito ergo sum!"* took for granted much that present day "behaviorists" deny, and besides it ended in the imprisonment of the universe within the "brain case" of the individual, for both Berkeley and Hume, and neither was remarkably successful in getting it out again.

There seems to be but one point of reconciliation at which *cultus* and philosophy may agree, and science and religion forget their age-long differences; and that lies at the heart of religious *worship, in the use of the sacred rite.*

After this somewhat lengthy digression from our immediate subject, let us return to the consideration of the entrance of Neoplatonism into Christian theology through St. Augustine. It is so generally admitted that whatever philosophy Augustine had was that of the Neoplatonic school, that we need only mention the fact as a point of departure for our argument. It is also universally insisted upon that he practically determined the form of the theology of the West, and exerted a profound influence on Greek thought as well. [41] Perhaps it is not so generally recognized that in St. Augustine, if my understanding of his position is correct, there were to be found the two conflicting elements which led to the controversies of the Reformation—(this much *must* be true, for he is the authority to which both sides appeal)—and also an inherent contradiction which finally appears in its clearness in the disputes concerning the "theory" of the Sacraments.

---

[41] It is essential to our purpose to notice at this point that the theology of the East was practically fixed at almost the same period, through the influence of the "Three Coppadocians" as they are called, Basil of Caesarea, his younger brother Gregory of Nyasa and Gregory of Nazianzus, a short time Bishop of Constantinople. The "authority" for the East, who occupies a similar prestige to that of Aquinas in the West, is John of Damascus (*obit. cir.* 754) who sums up the doctrine of the Cappadocians.

The "dualism" of faith and works, which is thought by some to be present even in the New Testament, dominates St. Augustine's thought. It never comes to an open contradiction, but he is ever under the pressure of the problem of its reconciliation. He had himself *experienced* the two realities of which he writes so much, first the sinfulness of man's mortal nature, of which he made his immortal "Confessions" but greater and more powerful than this, the reality of God's saving "grace." His philosophy insists that God is Supreme, while his experience insists just as vehemently that his own will is *his own.* And so we have in his writings the Sovereignty of God and the Freedom of man's will. Against Pelagius he argues for the necessity of divine assistance if man hopes to overcome his sinful nature and win salvation and eternal life, and against the Donatists he argues for the reality of the saving grace bestowed in the sacraments, in the face of absolute proof of apostacy and moral depravity. And all the while in his moral treatises he insists that man's will is *free* and that his salvation depends upon his "corresponding" with the will of God in *willing* obedience. Sin, he finds, is inherent in man's corrupt nature, and yet righteousness finds its only true expression in the will of man which is *free.* Is guilt "imputed" to man, for the sin of Adam, in which he had no part? Yes. Is sin the action of man's will, in asserting itself in opposition to the Will of God? Yes, decidedly yes. In other words sin is both "natural" and "ethical." For the healing of the one, which is in no sense the *fault* of man, some power *other* than that of man himself is necessary. This is mere logic. But for the reformation of man's wicked will, man himself, and he alone possesses the power, since this is surely a matter of his own responsibility, and even the omnipotence of God will not, nay *can* not, coerce the freedom of man's will, and God has *Himself* limited His omnipotence by its very gift to man. This, then, is the paradox which St. Augustine

bequeathed to Catholic and Protestant theology alike, but which any man can discover for himself if he will, in his own *experience,* as St. Augustine had done.

For the bestowal of that almost "substantial" thing which Augustine, following New Testament usage, called "grace" the Sacraments were divinely provided in the Church. But of what possible use can sacraments be, if man is free to sin, even against grace; and if the sovereign decrees of God are immutable, how can man's acts have any effect in undoing the salvation which the Church confers through the divinely instituted means of Grace? This was Augustine's problem, but he was the child of his age, and it was not of his own making.

Neoplatonism attempted to furnish an antidote for the pagan Mysteries, as Gnosticism had attempted to overcome the fatalism of astrology. As a substitute for a mechanical ritual formalism, with its non-moral view of salvation, Neoplatonism offered a moral asceticism coupled with a "spiritual" mysticism. The conflict of the two systems raged in the breast of Augustine, the Neoplatonic philosopher and Christian Mystic. But he left it still undecided, and it fell to the lot of an unknown writer of the fifth century, in all probability,[42] to carry the reconciliation one step farther, by suggesting that while the Sacraments were valuable as a means to an end, the *ultimate* end was the mystic union of the will of man with the Will of God, and when this had been attained, the sacraments and all the rest of the Ecclesiastical machinery would have fulfilled its usefulness.

Among the mysteries of literature, none seems to be more

---

[42] The dates given by Bishop Westcott are between 480 and 520 A. D. (*Contemporary Review,* May 1867, "Dionysius the Areopagite", p. 7.) The *limits* are set absolutely by the appearance of the writings at a Conference held at Constantinople in 532 (Mansi, *Concilia* XIII. col. 821) and the terminology of the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, 451 which occurs in them.

profound than that which surrounds the author of the writings which passed under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite.[43] Again we are forced to pass over the interesting details of the problem, over which we would fain tarry, to the outcome in the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments, all the essential elements of which can be traced to this source. The conflict of the two ideals which could not be reconciled by Augustine was resolved in a formal way by Dionysius, by the subordination of the mechanism of the mysteries to an individualistic contemplative mysticism. "The peculiar mysticism of the Apostles Paul and John was less intelligible to the early Middle Ages than the Christianized Neoplatonism of Dionysius the Areopagite; and even before Dionysius, Augustine * * * * conveys the *Enneads* by handfuls into his theological treatises."[44] The teachings of this anonymous or pseudonymous writer reflect the influence of an age of transition. He gathers up from Neoplatonism what

[43] Whoever he was, he may be called the flower of Neoplatonism. He sums up the work of Plotinus and Proclus, and gives them a Christian setting. The works of Dionysius have been published in the English translation of John Parker, (London, 1889) and portions, *i. e.* "Mystical Theology" in the *Jour. of Speculative Philos.* XXII. (1888), pp. 395-400 by Thos. Davidson, and in *Mysticism, Its true nature and value*, by A. B. Sharpe, (London, n. d.—1910?). For the discussion of the identification of the writer, *vide* Smith and Wace, *Dict. of Christian Biog.*, I. 841 ff., and the article of Bp. Westcott mentioned above; some notes on date with bibliography in Harnack, *Hist. Dog.*, IV. 282 n. 2, and on Dionysius' doctrinal system *ibid.* p. 338 n. 1; Inge, W. R., "Permanent Influence of Neo-Platonism on Xty." In *Amer. Jour. Theol.*, IV. (1900) pp. 328-344.

[44] Inge *ut supra*, p. 329. Though Dr. Inge does not mention it, the resemblance between the saying of Plotinus "For all things strive after that (*i. e.* The One) and aspire after it by necessity of nature, as if having a divination that without it they cannot be" (*Ennead* V. 5, 12) and the famous saying of St. Augustine: "For Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it repose in Thee" (*Confess.*, I. 1.) is most significant.

doctrines he deems to be of lasting value, or fitted to the peculiar exigencies of a defence of the Catholic faith, and by attaching them to a definite creed, and an organized hierarchal system gives to them a definiteness and compelling force which they did not before possess.[45] And his authority is quoted by subsequent theologians as quite final and decisive. What he *did* was nothing new or startling, but he succeeded in doing it in an unusually clever and successful way which immediately met with the approval of his time.[46] This sudden and lasting popularity was not the result of any mere coincidence, we may be sure, but demonstrates the fact that in his attempt to reconcile a newly evolved system of thought with the established rites of religion Dionysius supplied a vital need of his day.

The extant works attributed to Dionysius include four short treatises: On the Heavenly Hierachy, On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, On Divine Names, On Mystical Theology; and ten or eleven letters, one of which appears only in Latin, and is supposed by some to have been added by Erigina to his translation of the Areopagite. In the Hierarchies we have the means, the machinery as it were, by which God communicates Himself to man. In the Divine Names is set forth the unique and transcendental nature of God, who gives to each order of beings its proper share of the divine likeness, and assigns to each its share in the communication of the divine gifts to the order below it. The Mystic Theology marks out the reverse path to that shown in the

---

[45] *cf.* Westcott, *ut supra* p. 25-26.

[46] *cf.* Sharpe, *ut supra* p. 204. Harnack says (*Hist. Dog.*, III. 253) that Clement of Alexandria had already suggested the heavenly hierarchies in *Strom.* VI. 13, 107, while for Ignatius there had existed an earthly hierarchy centered in the Bishop, but Dionysius was the first to *relate* the two and combine them into a single comprehensive system. The heavenly order of the Areopagite obviously resembles that of Valentinus, however, and is on the "confines of the Alexandrian's speculation."

Hierarchies, and reveals the way by which the human soul ascends to mystic "union" with God.[47] These three elements correspond with those of which he makes the Hierarchy to consist: (1) a sacred order (τὰξις); (2) a sacred science (ἐπιστήμη); (3) a sacred operation (ἐνέργεια).[48]

"The Areopagite starts with metaphysics, but only, like Proclus, to kick down the ladder by which he mounted. He is the prince of mystics, because he expounds the rationale of his belief with perfect simplicity, without the least attempt to compromise with theology."[49] The Neoplatonic system which Dionysius appropriates from Proclus contains five elements which reappear plainly in the Hierarchies:

1. Progressive revelation from the Infinite.
2. Triads in systematic subordination.
3. The sole purpose and end is union with "The One."
4. Evil is the negation of good and to be overcome by positive activity.
5. Perfect being transcends all limitation.

It is to be noticed that this is not a *philosophical* system at all, but a purely religious one. Contemplation of the divine essence is not an intellectual transaction but an affair of the spirit. But between the supernatural Savior and man there is interposed a long system of intermediaries, both heavenly and earthly, the purpose of which is to enable the soul to climb from earth, by short steps and gradual transitions, up to the Only Good.[50]

After the occasional use of the terminology of the pagan Mysteries by earlier writers, we should not be surprised to find them in Dionysius, but it is perhaps a little startling to discover that there is no longer any hesitation about their

---

[47] This summary is from the article in Smith and Wace, *ut supra.*

[48] *cf. Cel. Hier.* III. 1.

[49] Bigg, Chas. *Neoplatonism,* (London, 1895) p. 343.

[50] *cf.* Bigg, *op. cit.,* p. 342. *Vide Cel. Hier.* III. 2.

use, but that the whole system has passed over bodily into the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. Even the more familiar titles for the sacred ministry are displaced by new terms, as are the simpler names of Baptism and the Eucharist. The Deacon has become Leiturgos, the Presbyter, Hierus, and the Bishop is now the Hierarch, and in the three grades of the "spiritual ascent" we have the familiar terms of the Mysteries, purification (κάθαρσις), initiation (μύησις) and perfection (τελεῖωσις). For Baptism we have "a holy birth in God" (ἡ θεῖα γέννησις) and the Eucharist becomes the goal of perfection, THE Initiation, par excellence (τελετῶν τελετὴ). The Triple "hierarchy" of the ecclesiastical system includes in the first rank or "order" the three sacraments of Baptism, Eucharist and Unction, the latter being remarkable as the *highest* of the three.[51] In the second rank come the three grades of the sacred ministry; and in the third, the three classes of the laity, Catechumens, communicants and "contemplatives."

We must remark that the order of the classification is rather confusing. The first *grade* of Hierarchy is the highest, and so on *down,* but the order in each grade is reversed, and reads *up.* The whole sequence of nine "ranks" arranged in their relative order of superiority, beginning with the lowest would be: Catechumen, Communicant, Contemplator; Deacon, Priest, Bishop; Baptism, Eucharist, Unction, and through these *downward* comes the divine revelation.[52]

---

[51] Here is to be discerned, no doubt, the direct influence of Gnosticism, which placed much emphasis on anointing.

Troelsch, (*Protestantism and Progress,* N. Y. 1912, p. 91) says: "Once the supreme miracle of the incarnation of God in Jesus and in the Bible is present, the continuation of this miracle in the hierarchy and the sacraments is a logical consequence; nothing short of the complete deification of the Church as an Institution can really prevent the humanization of the doctrines and truths."

[52] The ranks are given in *Eccl. Hier.* V. i. 6 and VI. i. 1. The

The "Hierarch" (Bishop) is made the source of all spiritual gifts in the church, and only through his offices can *any* of three Sacraments be observed, for by him alone can the holy oil of the "Muron" be consecrated, and this is necessary for the hallowing of the font for Baptism,[53] for the consecration of the altar, on which alone the Eucharist may be offered,[54] and finally it is essential in the rites of ordaining and consecrating both Priests and Deacons.[55] Material symbols, no matter how lowly, are made the means of mediating divine grace, and "we are led by sensible figures to the Divine contemplation." [56] But we must beware of a pitfall here, in drawing our conclusions from the doctrinal statements of Dionysius, for the material symbols, though they lead to contemplation, do not *themselves* confer the "deification" which is the desired end of the whole system, for this comes only through the contemplation itself:

"And this is the common goal of every Hierarchy,—the clinging love towards God and Divine things, divinely and uniformly ministered; and previous to this, the complete and unswerving removal of things contrary, the knowledge of things as they are in themselves; the vision and science of sacred truth; the inspired communication of the uniform perfection of The One Itself, as far as attainable; *the banquet of contemplation,* nourishing intelligibly, and *deifying every man* elevated towards it." [57]

---

procession of purification and enlightenment from above downward, in *Eccl. Hier.* V. i. 3; cf. *Cel. Hier.* III. 1; VIII. 2.

[53] *Eccl. Hier.* IV. iii. 10.

[54] *ibid.* V. i. 5.

[55] *ut supra cf.* I. ii. and iii.

[56] *Eccl. Hier.* I. ii; *cf.* VI. i. 2 and *Cel. Hier.* II. 3.

[57] *Eccl. Hier.* I. iii. The meaning is not unambiguous, but the sense appears, from the whole plan, to demand that deification be understood as the *final* result, reached only in contemplation, and symbolized by the unction of the Muron.

It is remarkable, in the light of subsequent controversy, to find that the familiar words of the Institution of the Eucharist are *not even referred to!* The important thing in the Eucharist is the *union* which it represents, a union between God and the faithful in which even the departed have their share at every celebration of this sacred rite.[58] The sacred "symbols" "signify Christ" present, but not at all in the sense in which we usually understand such an expression. It is not the sacred BODY and BLOOD of Christ, the presence of which is insisted upon, but the presence of His Divine Life in the life of every faithful Christian.

"And bear this religiously in mind, that when the worshipful symbols have been placed on the divine altar, through which (symbols) the Christ is signified and partaken, there is inseparably present the reading of the register of the holy persons, signifying the indivisible conjunction of their supermundane and sacred union with him." [59]

"For he (the Hierarch) delineates in these things under sensible forms, our intelligible life in figures, by brining to view the Christ Jesus from the Hidden within the Divine Being, out of love to man made like unto us by the all-perfect incarnation of our race, from us and advancing to the divided condition of ourselves without change from the essential One, and calling the human race, through this beneficent love of man, into participation with Himself and His own good things, provided we are united to His most Divine Life by our assimilaition to it, as far as possible; and *by this* in very truth, *we shall have been perfected,* as partakers of God and of Divine things." [60]

The problem of a later age, as to *what* was received in the Eucharist, does not seem yet to have emerged. The

---

[58] *Eccl. Hier.* III. iii. 3, 8 and 12. The Eucharist is called also σύναξις.

[59] *ibid.* III. iii. 9.

[60] *ibid.* III. iii. 13

reference here seems to be merely to the Incarnation in its objective and historical aspect. The use of the rite is central and indispensable, but it requires a fit preparation for its reception, if it is to be effective in bringing about a union with Christ, since the reception of the benefits conferred in and through the rite is conditioned on the spiritual fitness of the recipient:

" . . . the most Divine and common and peaceful distribution of one and the same, both Bread and Cup, enjoins upon them a godly fellowship in character, as having a fellowship in food, and recalls to their memory the most Divine Supper, and arch-symbol of the rites performed, agreeably with which the Founder of the symbols himself excludes, most justly, him who had supped with Him on holy things, not piously and in a manner suitable to his character; teaching at once, clearly and Divinely, that the approach to the Divine Mysteries with a sincere mind confers, on those who draw nigh, the participation in a gift according to their own character." [61]

There is an enigmatic passage in the Divine Names which has been interpreted by some Roman commentators as referring to the death of the Blessed Virgin, but it is not unlikely that it was intended to apply to the Eucharist. It

---

[61] *Eccl. Hier.* III. iii. 1. The unworthy and the uninitiated are excluded from the Holy Mysteries. (*ut supra* III. iii. 7; VII. ii. 3). This and the use of the expression "holy things" which still is prominent in the 'elevation" of the Greek Liturgies, appear in almost identical form in the pagan Mysteries. At Eleusis, the "unclean" were always warned to withdraw, in a formula, the name of which, προόρρησις, is still used in the Greek Liturgies for the dismissal of the unbaptised, and the formula "holy things to the holy" (τὰ Ἅγια τῶν Ἁγίον) is mentioned by Apuleius in the form: "Make way for the holy things." (*Metam.* XI. 9). On the exclusion of the unworthy, *cf.* Foucart, *Myst. d'Eleu.*, pp. 311-312.

speaks of "the spectacle of the body which was the beginning of life and the recipient of God." [62]

It is quite impossible to summarize the teaching of Dionysius satisfactorily in so brief a space as this, but I believe that I have truly represented his teaching about the Sacraments. It was Dionysius who first gave a clear and definite expression to the "instrumental" view of the Church's sacred rites and fitted them into an ordered system. In this he may be called the first of the Schoolmen. But he gives a place to but *four* of the seven rites which eventually were raised to the dignity of Sacraments, and, what is most peculiar of all he made them *all* of but temporary importance, as means of reaching the final goal of Contemplation. [63]

As the architect of the Capitol at Washington faced his creation toward the broad Potomac, whither he expected the city to extend, and failed to anticipate the peculiarly practical needs of the generations to come, so Dionysius the Areopagite planned the structure of his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy to meet the religious needs of his day *as he saw them,* but the subsequent need of the Church led to the growth of the sacramental system in the opposite direction. The later Schoolmen of East and West built on the foundation he had laid, but the final edifice was not of his planning. [64] The Mystic

---

[62] ἐπὶ τὴν θεαν τοῦ ζωαρχικοῦ και Θεοδόχον σωματος·

[63] And for this reason Unction becomes superior to the Eucharist.

[64] St. Thomas Aquinas may be said to be the doctrinal authority of the West, and in the third part of his *Summa,* which treats of the Sacraments, there are thirty-one explicit references to the Areopagite. For the sake of reference I append this list: The references are all to Part III. with its Supplement.

Quest. 61, 4, ad 1	*Eccl. Hier.* 5
63, 2, ii.	*Eccl. Hier.* 2
64, 1, i.	*Eccl. Hier.* 5
64, 6, c.	*Eccl. Hier.* 1
ibid.	*Epis.* 8
65, 1, iii.	*Eccl. Hier.* 2 and 5

Way, in which Dionysius was the pioneer, is essentially subjective, personal and individualistic. The final goal of the discipline of life, as he saw it, was the rejection of all

66, 3, i.	*Eccl. Hier.* 2
67, 1, ii.	*Eccl. Hier.* 5 and 7
67, 1, c.	*Cel. Hier.* 7
67, 1, ad 1	*Eccl. Hier.* 5
67, 1, ad 2	*Eccl. Hier.* 2
67, 7, c.	*Eccl. Hier.* 2
ibid.	*Eccl. Hier.* Preface, last part.
71, 4, i.	*Eccl. Hier.* 5
71, 4, ad 3	*Eccl. Hier.* 2
72, 2, ad 1	*Eccl. Hier.* 4
75, 1, c.	*Eccl. Hier.* 3
78, 4, ad 4	*Eccl. Hier.* 7
78, 9, ii.	*Eccl. Hier.* 3
78, 9, ad 3	*Cel. Hier.* 2
83, 4, c. (1)	*Eccl. Hier.* 3
83, 4, c. (5)	*Eccl. Hier.* 3
Supp. Quest. 29, 1, ii.	*Eccl. Hier.* 3 and 5
34, 1, c.	*Eccl. Hier.* 5
36, 1, c.	*Eccl. Hier.* 3
36, 3, ii.	*Eccl. Hier.* 4
37, 1, c.	*Eccl. Hier.* 3
37, 2, i.	*Eccl. Hier.* 3
37, 2, c.	*Eccl. Hier.* 3 and 5
37, 2, c.	*Eccl. Hier.* 3 and 5
37, 4, vi.	*Eccl. Hier.* 5

Here is ample evidence of the extent to which Dionysius has influenced the theological doctrine of the West, so far as the Sacraments are concerned.

Aquinas was known as "The Angelic Doctor" and is referred to for the "doctrine" of Angels, but this he got *en bloc* from the Areopagite. We have not mentioned the Heavenly or Celestial Hierarchy, since it does not fall strictly within the subject of our study, but it is of interest to note, in passing how widely this treatise has influenced popular thought concerning the Angels. It underlies some of the greatest productions of English literature, specifically: the first is Spencer's "Hymne of Heavenly Beautie," especially lines 2 to 105. Later the same grouping of

things belonging to this earthly life, and the loss of self in mystic union with the Great Unknown. "And so it is that he is unable to see in their full beauty and strength, those

---

the Angelic Host is found in Milton's Paradise Lost, (Bk. V. line 772 ff.; *cf.* line 600 ff., 840-841; Bk. X. line 85 ff., 460.) Shakespeare had the same in mind, in all probability, when he wrote:

"Still choiring the young-eyed Cherubins."
(Mer. of Ven., V. 1, 62).

and

"O, a Cherubin thou wast that did preserve me."
(Tempest, I. 2, 152).

for the Areopagite introduces the idea of "guardian angels." (*Cel. Hier.* IX. 3).

The Holy Orthodox Church looks to John of Damascus, as the Roman Church does to Aquinas. The "Longer Catechism" of the Eastern Church, which is "authoritative" rests its sacramental teaching on John of Damascus, citing him in Question 340. (*cf.* Schaff, *Creeds*, II. 497). The quotation is from his *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, Bk. IV., chap. 13, sec. 7. If we refer to this treatise, we find that chapter 13 treats "Concerning the holy and immaculate Mysteries of the Lord" and there is another chapter, the ninth, which treats specifically of Faith and Baptism.

An examination of the *Exposition* reveals the fact that John of Damascus calls Dionysius "the holy Dionysius" (I. 9), "the Divine Dionysius" (I, 12), "that most holy and sacred and gifted theologian" (II. 3), "the divinely-inspired disciple" of the Apostle, (III. 6), and finally "the blessed Dionysius." (III. 19)

These five passages refer directly to his writings, as follows:

I. 9 to *Div. Names.* 2, 3 and 4.
I. 12 to *Div. Names.* 1.
II. 3 to *Cel. Hier.* 6.
III. 6 to *Div. Names* 2.
III. 19 to *Epis.* 4.

But the whole of this treatise reflects the writings of Dionysius, whom he treats as of equal authority with the Cappadocians, of whose work (especially Basil, *De Spir. Sanc.*, Greg. Naz. "The Thologian," *Orat.*, and Gregory Nyssae, *De. Bap.*, and *Orat. Catechet.*) John furnished a summary. The *fourth* book makes

instincts and faculties of man, by which he is impelled toward social combination and the divine institutions by whch these instincts and faculties are sanctioned and supported."[65] Dionysius laid his emphasis on contemplative mysticism, but the Sacramental system, as it subsequently developed under the influence of a truly Catholic ecclecticism, produced a well balanced mechanism for combining a living social expression in outward worship and a life of human helpfulness, with that peculiarly individual emotional experience which leads to a personal conviction of the fellowship of the Holy Spirit and of communion with the Infinite.[66]

The doctrines usually associated with the Eucharist, and round which the controversies between the Catholic and Protestant theologians have raged, have no *necessary* connection with the rite itself, and so have no particular interest for us in our study, which is devoted to the *continuous use of the rite itself in spite of these* doctrinal disputes. They grew out of the purely theological discussions concerning the Person and Nature of Christ, which ended in the promulgation of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan and Chalcedonian formulas of the "orthodox" faith. Catholics who

---

practically no reference to Dionysius, however, a fact which supports our contention that the actual progress of doctrine was *away* from the scheme of the Areopagite, though it started with his premises. The logical realism of the West, never found place in the Eastern formularies, and the Roman doctrine that the act of "consecration" in the Eucharist took place at the pronouncing of the words of Institution has been stoutly combatted by Eastern theologians, who maintain, in the *spirit* of Dionysius, that the *Epiklesis* is the central, though not the solely essential part of the rite.

[65] Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[66] For some remarks on "the psychological significance of legal and ceremonial religion" which touch on the problem of the relation of the individual to social religion, *vide* Galloway, *Principles of Religious Development*, (London, 1909), pp. 185 ff.

believe in "transubstantiation" and Calvinists who deny any real effects to the reception of the Sacrament, Anglicans and Lutherans who believe in a "real presence" but who may affirm or deny that its *reception* is in any tanglble way connected with the material "symbols" but depends on the faith of the recipient, all agree in the continuous observance of the sacred rite of the Holy Communion, though their theological bickerings may stop them from actually *uniting* in the formal ritual of the Sacramental rite.

If I have succeeded in demonstrating the fact that any and all doctrine is wholly secondary to the continued use of the rite itself, and derived from the determination to persevere in this use in the face of changing intellectual ideas, I will have done all I had hoped. The development of *some* form of doctrine was inevitable, and its continued revision and readjustment is just as inevitable. But the actual living rite, living in the religious practice of the Church, is the primary thing. Given this, and given also a belief in a transcendent God and in an *infallible* record preserved in the New Testament,[67] and though for nearly a millenium there was constant growth and expansion, the final triumph of Aristotelian philosophy, coupled with a relentless logic, was bound eventually to force all divergence into a fixed and changeless uniformity, patterned after the ideals of reality and perfection. The Schoolmen did their work well, and it has satisfied the demands of nearly another millenium. If today, however, there is a growing feeling that the day of its power has come to an end, it is not because the Sacraments themselves have ceased to be of value, but only because we

---

[67] In his *Civ. Dei*, XI. 6, St. Augustine speaks of the Scriptures as "sacred and infallible" and he bases his doctrine on them. This conception was present among Jewish writers, and is seen emerging in Josephus, *Cont. Apion*, II. 15 ff.

have outgrown the conceptions on which their doctrinal exposition has been made to rest.[68]

[68] "We see, at any rate, that it is a *theological* readjustment which is required and not one in Natural Science. Moreover it is a theological readjustment in the highest sense conservative and positive." Waggett, P. N., *Religion and Science.* (London, 1909), p. 89.

XII

THE VALUE OF THE SACRAMENTS

After this lengthy consideration of the origin and development of religious rites in general and the relation of the Sacraments to this larger subject, we find ourselves face to face with the real problem of the whole matter, which is: do the Sacraments supply any real need of human nature, do they serve any useful purpose in religion, do they answer the cry of the seeker after God and righteousness, or are they merely a relic of barbarism, the stronghold of a dying superstition and meet only to be banished from enlightened and ethical Christianity?

We can not deny the undoubted fact that for well nigh 1900 years the Sacraments have continued to dominate the Christian cult and have withstood the strain of changing environment, of growing culture, and for full four centuries the rising tide of theological controversy and intellectual attack. Surely such "survival" can not be the result of mere chance; there must be *some* element of "fitness" to account for it! We do not continue to do everything that our forefathers did, we are not victims of that *vis inertiae* which stifles the spirit of progress in the savage breast; nor do we adopt *everything* that comes to us out of the past. There seems to be, *a priori,* some probability that these rites have continued in use through all these years because they did something that needed to be done. We may permit ourselves the use of the term *a priori* since we must come to grips with the intellectual problem which the facts force upon us, but we need to find something more than a merely intellectual basis

for our judgment of the worth of the Sacraments, if we hope to establish this worth beyond the power of *speculative* doubt and disparagement. The whole course of our argument has been directed toward the discovery of a positive and fundamental basis in human nature on which the use of religious rites may be shown to rest, and it appears at last, after our search, to lie in the physiological constitution of human personality. These are high sounding words, but the reality which they represent in technical terms is most simple.

Instincts and emotions and reflex reactions, stimuli and inhibition are terms of the schools, but language and gesture are the common heritage of us all.[1] Perhaps we have never thought much about it, but the wonderful thing about language is that it produces the same effect, in a general way,[2] on everyone who hears it. If the hearer understands it at all, the effect is determined beforehand, the only condition being that both the speaker and the hearer use words in the same sense, and this requisite is supplied by "convention."[3] The language may be any that you will "chacun son goût." We never stop to consider what a wonderful, may we not say mysterious, process it is by which a child learns a language, for strictly speaking the child does not *learn* it all, he just absorbs it; it comes. Might we ask why or how? Present-day psychology is gradually coming to understand

[1] I am indebted for the following analysis to Prof. George H. Mead's lectures on Social Psychology. A text book by him, which is promised, will show the setting of the argument.

[2] The exceptions, which will occur to everyone, are due to the individual peculiarities of the hearer, and not to the language itself.

[3] It is not without significance that St. Paul's words "Else if thou bless with the spirit, how shall he that filleth the place of the unlearned say the Amen at thy giving of thanks (*eucharistia*), seeing he knoweth not what thou sayest?" (I Cor. 14:16) occur so soon after his account of the Institution of the Eucharist.

something of the process. Somehow or other the child begins life with an irresistable impulse to *talk;* he is "made that way." And everyone that comes into contact with a baby devotes as much as his time as he can spare, to talking *to* that baby, and some day he just starts out and speaks with a definiteness of meaning that dumbfounds his parents.[4] In the child's experience the *things* come first, then social convention supplies the names for them.

Language is one kind of gesture. Purely motor gesture was probably the earlier method of communication, and we still use it much to-day. It is "magical." If you doubt this, take your stand on the street corner of a crowded thoroughface and gaze attentively up into space, and be convinced that gesture is positively magical in the silent and irresistable control it exerts on others.

Perhaps the most frequent use made of gestures is when we are "excited," or under emotional strain. We do not realize that we are *expressing* our emotion in this way, but again, it just "happens." Sudden bursts of passion are always associated with these demonstrative movements, and accompanied by other physical disturbances,[5] and the quickest and surest way to get oneself into any particular emotional state is to *stimulate* it by going through the motions which represent it. If you "let yourself go" at the first feeling of indignation or resentment, you will soon find yourself in a pretty rage, and if, after you shouted FIRE in the theatre as suggested above, you bolted for the door like everybody else—merely to avoid suspicion, of course—the chances are that before you *did* get out you were pretty thoroughly scared, and thought yourself lucky to get out alive.

Now there must be some fundamental *reason* why gestures have this power to suggest activity and to start it off, as it

[4] *cf.* Josephine Daskam Bacon, *The Autobiography of a Baby.*

[5] On the various theories of the emotions *vide* Shand, *op. cit., ut supra* p. 44; McDougall, *op. cit.; ut supra* p. 45, chaps. 4 and 5.

were. It is not enough to say it is the result of association of ideas, or of imitation, or the expression of an acquired habit. These are just mere *names* for it and do not *explain* it at all. But Darwin suggested a real explanation, in the form of a principle of action which he called "serviceable associated habits." [6] What he suggested was that there was, in certain activities, a preservation value for the organism, which originally prompted them, and that this value-tone, or "feeling" or whatever you wish to call it, was in this way attached to or inseparably linked up with the act itself, so that when any sign of it appears, as in some preliminary gesture, the emotional tone immediately makes itself felt too. In this way the gesture becomes the symbol of the emotion, and because all other individuals of the same type of organism "feel" the same way, the gesture has meaning for them all. This has the advantage of giving us a non-intellectual explanation of the phenomenon we are considering.

As we have already suggested, conduct or behavior is action directed toward a goal or purpose, and this same principle may be applied in the interpretation of such conduct. In other words, this is the principle we have all along been applying, in trying to discover from the *result* of any activity, the probable stimulus which provoked it. This carries us *behind* consciousness, since it will apply to habitual or other acts which are not consciously apprehended by the actor. Consciousness is an index of the *purpose* of an action, since it is only when several possible things can be done, under the circumstances, and we must choose between them, that we are *conscious* of what we are doing at all. Sometime, long since, you decided, by some process of elimination if it ever presented itself to you as a *problem,* which shoe you would put on *first,* and since then you have not bothered about it, but if you stop yourself some morn-

[6] Darwin, *Expression of Emotion in Man and Animals,* (N. Y., 1873), p. 28.

ing in the act, you will realize how perfectly hopeless it would be for you to have to decide this momentous question every morning, and with nothing really significant to determine your choice.[7] When we have to decide between several possibilities of action, what we really do is to consider their *ends* in the making of our choice, and hidden behind this choice is the mechanism (if we may use this word of a psychological process) by which it is brought about. This ability to adapt *present* conduct to a *future* end distinguishes what we call self-consciousness, and the organization of our habits through what we call "mind" makes the necessary motor control possible.

We are used to thinking of man as being able to carry out his ideas and put them into action, as we say, but we overlook the significant fact that in doing so he thinks of the end he wishes to accomplish, and scarcely gives a thought to *himself*. For we control things by thinking of them, keeping our "eye on the ball," as it were, and not by concentrating our attention on *self;* we must put our attention on *how* we are doing a thing, and so thoroughly have we accustomed ourselves to doing this that for the most part the *ultimate* end of our activity is wholly forgotten. What we call perception, is the selection from all the confused mass of sensations which come to us from the world "without," of

---

[7] I once heard Pres. King of Oberlin, in a public lecture, recite a limerick about a centipede that fell into the ditch when it was asked by a frog how it could manage so many feet, which illustrates such indecision:

"The centipede was happy quite,
Until the frog for fun,
Said 'Pray, which leg comes after which?'
Which wrought his mind to such a pitch,
He lay distracted in a ditch,
Considering *how* to run."

(*Rational Living*, (N. Y. 1914) p. 194).

some single stimulus or group of stimuli and making that, for the moment, the monarch of the little realm "within." [8]

Meaning is primarily "objective" because it is primarily just *possible* conduct, and it enters into its "subjective" inheritance only through the alchemy of experience. Experience puts *new* wine into *old* bottles [9] but though the bottles burst from the force of the ferment within, not a drop of the wine is lost! By that witchery we call "memory," we are enabled to strip off the imagery from experience, and to weave out of it a magic mantle, clad in which we go forth to conquer our world.

But no one of us is alone in the world and our conduct must be adjusted to the conduct of others, in fact it seems most likely that the only way we can ever come to a consciousness of *self* at all is through the gradual synthesis and fusion of our percepts of others. In the veriest reality we are, at first at least, what others think of us, and it is almost impossible ever to escape this influence.[10] Social conduct assumes some sort of adjustment to ends on the part of the "other" as well as the self, and so it differs from mere physical (individual) conduct in that the "other" may be affected and in some sense directed or controlled by it. Hence the peculiarity of a *social* act is this ability which it possesses to influence the activity of other selves. Ordinarily, as we have just now said, the significance of any of *our own* acts

---

[8] What wisdom was that, begotten of insight or experience, which wrote into the Liturgies of the West, as the Collect for the First Sunday after the Epiphany, the single supplication: "grant that they may both perceive and know what things they ought to do, and also may have grace and power faithfullly to fulfil the same."?

[9] How pedantic is the Revised version!

[10] cf. Cooley, C. H., *Human Nature and the Social Order*, (N. Y., 1912), chaps. 5 & 6, "The Social Self." "There is no sense of 'I', as in pride or shame, without its correlative senses of you, of he, or they." (*ibid.*, p. 151).

lies not in the act itself, much less in its inception or the particular stimulus which provokes it, but in its purpose, in the finished activity of which it is but an insignificant element. With the *social* act, on the contrary, it is quite the reverse. It is at the very beginning, as in a fencing match, that the act is most pregnant with possibilities, and only by quick perception of its significance and rapid adjustment accordingly, can it be of any use to discover this significance at all. The familiar and somewhat crude expression of this important truth is found in the phrase "he never knew what struck him." In the social act, then, control of the activity is present from the very start, and its inception is generally, if not always, conscious and deliberate. It is this early adaptation which also characterizes what we know as gestures, and our analysis of the way in which this adaptation has apparently come about should throw some light on the relation of gestures to emotion and their uncanny power to influence the activities and emotions of others beside ourselves.

The reason that gestures have any value at all, seems to lie in this very power to provoke a response in others, and the most striking example of this is found in language, which is but an elaborate and conventionalized vocal gesture.[11] The tenseness or suspense of expectancy with which we await the development of some activity on the part of another, which has a vital interest for us, will throw some light on the generation of emotion through gesture. For the social act, of which we are speaking, is always more full of what we

[11] Judd, C. H., *Psychology.* (New York, 1907), pp. 248 ff. "Articulate sounds are simplified forms of experience capable, through association with ideas, of expressing meanings not directly related to sounds themselves." (*ibid.* p. 257)

Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 333: "The upholders of the image say that you can not only think it by silent speech, but that you can also *imagine* the act and the movement will follow. Our contention is that in thought the words *must be uttered* silently before the habitual act arises."

call "imagery" because it represents to us more possibilities in the way of our own response to it, and yet we must eliminate most of these, and concentrate on a single act, with a single purpose in view. It is by the suppression of the larger part of these conflicting motor impulses that we succeed in accomplishing this concentration, and this damming up of our impulses produces the emotion. We find in the gesture a weapon which, like the fiery sword of the Guardian of the Garden of Eden, turns every way; it affects equally both ourselves and others.

We have already said it in a multitude of ways, but here we must repeat that the religious rite is a form of gesture, a means of compelling human activity.[12] We saw that "magic" was not of necessity "mechanical" because it made allowance for the possession of an adverse will, but contrived to compass its conquest. Freedom of the will is of no more use than coin of the realm, unless it be put to work. It is the *forming* of the autonomous will that lies at the basis of character, and all the ennobling efforts of man have been concentrated on the single problem of teaching the individual to "abhor that which is evil and cleave to that which is good."[13] This has always been the desire of any religion worthy of the name, and is the sole end and purpose of the Christian religion, and throughout the ages the appeal of religion has been to man's *emotions*.

It has become a fad to-day to talk much of "intellectual" religion, and to decry the remnants of emotionalism which still

---

[12] "Now it is admitted by all of us that words spoken or faintly articulated belong really in the realm of behavior as do movements of the arms and legs. If implicit behavior can be shown to consist of nothing but word movements (or expressive movements of the word type) the behavior of the human being as a whole is as open to objective control as the behavior of the lowest organism." (Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 21).

[13] Romans 12:9.

cling to the cult practices of Christianity.[14] But we may discern signs of a change of sentiment in this respect, and all the labors of the anthropologists and students of the social sciences are hastening on the change, for we are coming to see that what we call intellect or understanding is not an end in itself, but only a means to the control of conduct, and much less powerful in exerting such control than the more primi-

[14] Such expressions are quite common in *controversial* literature, but to these I do not refer. They are also seriously advanced in discussions of the basic principles of religion. I may illustrate what I mean by the following quotations:

"Sacramentarianism, although it claims a divine sanction, has in reality more affinity with the magic of primitive religion: it is in substance a survival, not a true development of the religious idea." (Galloway, *op. cit.*, p. 190)

"No ceremonial religion has been able to resist the fallacy of the *opus operatum*, the efficacy of the deed itself. Since the ceremonial acts possess intrinsic value, that value increases with repetition: the accent is on the performance rather than on the motive." (*ibid.* 186.)

"But the sacrametal doctrines and customs of religion spring from the living and perennial superstition of the masses. They exist not merely because it is the fashion to cultivate them, but also because the magic and mystery which they involve are native to unenlightened minds." (Here follows a quotation from Crawley and one from Sumner to illustrate the "magical" parallel.)

"When human nature rises above primitive conditions into scientific concepts and into a broader, many-sided civilization, the earlier customs are transformed by new content or entirely discarded." (Ames, *Psychology of Religion*, p. 192)

In striking contrast to these opinions is that of Prof. G. B. Smith, (*Social Idealism*, pp. 25 ff.) that the Sacraments were "signs" of communion with Christ *through his spiritual body*, the community, and were *not magical.*

The strictly reactionary doctrine is expressed by Dean Groton: "But this general view of the relationship of sacramental communion can hardly fail either to reduce Christianity to a natural religion among the rest or else lift all religions to the level of Christianity. The 'internal force' must be everywhere one and the same,—either a mere natural energy or a divine energy—

tive and more instinctive emotions. Intellect is ethical, reason is its substance, and it has led mankind on toward the good, and altered the visage of his vision, but for all that the basic emotions remain the stronger incentives to conduct.

"There may be little new in the idea that Christianity, plus civilization, has literally brought nothing into man's emotional religious experience, which he did not possess before, yet one has only to lay the savage examples beside the serried ranks of confessants, and it will be brought home to the mind with an overwhelming freshness and force. The es-

---

and therefore, the results everywhere must stand on the same general plane. We must stand by the testimony of the Biblical records until that testimony is proven wholly mistaken and it is demonstrated that the religion of the Bible is no more exceptionally divine than that of Mithraism or Gnosticism." (*The Christian Eucharist and the Pagan Cults*, pp. 104-105.)

Certain words appear as bugaboos to certain people. To the person of "Evangelical" bent, the word "magic" is such a word, in connection with religion. On the other hand to one who has grown up amid "Catholic" traditions, the word "natural" is *taboo* in religion. But fortunately for religion, science is relentlessly forcing these two classes of people to join forces, and it may be found that the magical is the natural, after all.

But what both sides to this dispute overlook, is that there is room for a really natural and scientific explanation of the *demonstrable* results of an earnest and trustful use of a religious rite, without in any way encroaching upon the realm of metaphyscs, or entering into the discussion of where the "natural" stops and the so-called "super-natural" begins.

From the point of view of individual psychology the religious rite, specifically the Christian sacrament, has a distinct *functional* value in that it supplies something *to do* in the way of expressing a religious impulse. Just as the habit of telling the truth can be established by *doing* it, and the ethical sentiment of respect for truthfulness thus strengthened, so there is a very real sense in which the "grace" of one's Communions may be increased by making them *often*. In such ways the sentiment of obedience to God's will may be strengthened and developed to withstand the strain of some real moral crisis.

sence of emotional religion (which for the object of the present enquiry we have just agreed to differentiate from those processes evolving intellectual belief) the stuff of this feeling has not changed since man went out from his cave to slay the sabre-toothed tiger, and to adore the stars of heaven. Terror and adoration filled him then; and to the same terror and adoration he now gives alien names."

Such is the conclusion of the authoress of a most illuminating and challenging book, the purpose of which was the examination of the published autobiographies and religious confessions of four hundred and fifty-one individuals, whose names are published as an appendix, and upon such a comprehensive study of "cases" this conclusion rests.[15] To me it furnishes overwhelming evidence of two things, the incurably religious nature of man, and the indestructably emotional character of religion.

It seems to me that we have to choose between two alternatives, either no religion or the continued and increasing use of religious rites. Perhaps this is a dangerous alternative to suggest, but I find myself, after our study of the history of religious rites, unable to escape it. For if we admit, as I believe we must, that the essence of religion has always been emotional, then there is no reason to believe that it will cease to be so, and the only known way of *controlling* this emotion is through the use of religious rites.[16]

Throughout the history of the Christian Church there have been, to my knowledge, but two societies of professing Christians who have entirely rejected the use of the Sacra-

[15] Burr, Mrs. Anna Robeson, *Religious Confessions and Confessants*, p. 421. This is but a subsidiary conclusion of her investigation. Her main contention is in line with her intellectualist presuppositions, and illustrates the condemnation of emotional religion to which I have referred. It is a surprise to me that after such a truly scientific and inductive study of *facts* she should interpret them in the way she appears to do.

[16] Obviously the individual can learn to control his emotions,

ments, the Society of Friends and the Salvation Army. It is not at first obvious that both of these have instinctively evolved or hit upon substitutes for the Sacraments which serve, for them, the purpose of generating religious emotion, but it seems open to question whether these substitutes serve equally well as a means of *control,* in the sense of preventing wholly unedifying excesses. The Friends accomplish it by suppression, inhibition, elimination of everything in the way of outward decoration or beauty which might in any way interfere with perfect abstraction. Silence in "meeting" unless moved by the spirit, and the chilling and depressing barrenness of the Meeting House all aid in heightening the emotional effect. Have you ever been at some solemn and depressing function, such as a large state funeral, when silence hung like a pall over the multitude, and been suddenly overwhelmed with a feeling that if you could not *do* something you *must* involuntarily, *scream,* even *in spite of yourself?* If so, you can understand how, by a strange paradox, the simplicity of the Friends led to their being commonly known as Quakers.

The Salvation Army represents the opposite extreme. Their method is the method of the primitive savage, of the prehistoric votaries of Dionysus, with dance and song and cymbal and drum, with torches and harangues on the streets at night. The description which we quoted from Farnell [17] of the primitive Dionysiac orgy might almost have stood for these present-day enemies of the devil. This is the method of excitement which also prevails to so large an extent in the so-called "revival meetings" among some of the Protestant denominations.[18] The type of emotional reaction here is similar to that at a base-ball game, where the "fan" is car-

or rather to give them proper outlet, but I am speaking of social control.

[17] *supra* p. 117.

[18] Davenport, F., *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals,* (N. Y. 1905).

ried away by the excitement and the shouting, and smashes his new straw hat to a pulp on the back of his unresponsive or sweetly oblivious neighbor, as the case may be.

The purpose of the Sacraments is to supply such a social control that the *wastefulness* of the vagaries of neither of these extremes shall be necessary. The Sacraments of the Church, if faithfully used, supply the opportunity for "conversion" at the time when it should normally come about, and also at such other times of stress as peculiar circumstances may demand. But the Sacramental system of the Christian Church does not make any provision for *revival;* it eliminates it. The religious life of the individual, it is assumed, will begin in infancy and continue under Christian nurture, without break or catastrophic upheaval but with orderly development and growing fulness, through the whole of life. The possibility of relapse is always present, to be sure, but the danger of it is minimized by the ever-present influence of social control which supports and reinforces the will of the individual.

As has already been made quite evident the one and only pre-requisite to make the action of the Sacraments possible is *belief* in their efficacy, but this belief and confident trust in them makes the results sure.[19] There is ample justification for that insistence on the necessity of *faith,* in this sense, on the part of the recipient, which has always been present in Christion theology, both Catholic and Protestant. But if our analysis of the psychology of gesture has been correct, the Calvinistic contention that the Sacraments are mere *signs* of a changed relation which has already taken place, and do not produce any effect in themselves, is farther from the truth than the much callumniated *ex opere operato* theory of the medieval Schoolmen. Each is, however, but a half-truth, the Protestant theory insisting on the moral act of the will, the

[19] The sophisticated quibble of the theologians that the grace of the sacrament was suspended, as it were, (*in posse*) by a lack of consenting faith, is an expression of this fact.

profession of faith in God and the turning to him, which finds its *expression* in the *use* or acceptance of the sacraments, while the Catholic view insists on the positive emotional reaction and sense of exaltation and purification which *results from this use.*

The sentiment which accepts the dictum that the Sacraments are sacred rites, hallowed by immemorial use and certified by the experience of generations of the faithful who have found solace and strength in them, is essentially unrational, like *all* sentiments, and is taken in by the baptized infant with its mother's milk.[20] This sentiment grows under social influence and by didactic additions, and becomes that element of Christian faith which underlies the use of the Sacraments.[21] Without this underlying faith the continued use of any rite becomes impossible, or purely conventional and sterile. From the dawn of Christianity this belief in the efficacy of the sacramental means of grace has been an essential part of the professed faith of the Church's members, and it has gradually become more and more explicit in the Creeds and more prominent in theology. Since the reformation, however, the right of this "sacramentalism" to recognition as an integral part of the faith has been strenuously

[20] The behaviorist school of psychology has nothing to say of sentiments. The sense in which I use the term will be shown by the following quotations. "These relatively permanent dispositions are what we designate our sentiments. Love, friendship, enmity, etc., are the names by which we know such characteristics." (Angell, *Psychology*, p. 392); "Mr. Shand points out that our emotions, or, more strictly speaking, our emotional dispositions, tend to become organized in systems about the various objects and classes of objects that excite them. * * * The oftener the object of the sentiment becomes the object of any of the emotions comprised in the system of the sentiment, the more readily will it evoke that emotion again. * * * (McDougal, *Social Psychology*, pp. 122, 127).

[21] Such elements in the Creeds as belief in the Holy Catholic Church, or "one baptism for the remission of sins."

challenged, and since the days of Hume a growing spirit of a much vaunted scientific intellectualism, *within* the ranks of professing Christians, has joined forces with a materialistic and agnostic science, to belittle and controvert the continued use of what they consider "empty ceremonial." [22] One of the greatest polemical questions *within* the Church to-day, the all-engrossing problem of Church Unity,[23] centers round this very use of sacraments, and no definite plan for reuniting the sundered groups of Christians can ever be evolved, much less carried into execution, till the kindred question of the use or disuse of the Sacraments has been faced and settled. It is the disunion of Christendom which has dethroned the Sacraments from their former place of preeminence, and I am thoroughly convinced that no other force but these same Sacraments can ever bind the sundered members into one "body" again.[24]

---

[22] The tribute paid to the Catholic system by Positivism in borrowing its ceremonial, must not, however, be overlooked.

[23] It is important to distinguish internal from external disputes. Of the *validity* of a belief in God I have nothing to say; I assume that I am addressing those who are already convinced of its truth.

[24] Troeltsch writes as follows of the future: "Taking it all in all, we may fairly say that the religion of personal conviction and conscience, *basing itself upon history, but not petrifying history into dogma*, is the form of religion which is homogeneous with and adapted to modern individualistic civilization."

(The italics are mine.)

"There remains, as a stand-by for the coming days of oppression and decline of freedom, that which has given to the whole fabric a goodly portion of its strength—the religious metaphysics of freedom and of a faith based on personal conviction. * * *" (*Prot. and Prog.*, pp. 203 ff.)

I do not know what he anticipates in the way of oppression and the restriction of freedom, but I am convinced that the *danger* of our American civilization, at least, lies in unrestrained individualism. If we are to have a religion which rests on history, it must perpetuate the use of the Christian Sacraments,

The inevitable tendency of the emphasis on individual experience which is the distinctive mark of modern thought, was toward a revolt against institutional control, and found its fullest expression in Protestantism. But the mark was the

---

and I know of no other way in which individual freedom, and a faith based on personal conviction can be as certainly assured or as efficiently fostered. And the use of the Sacraments guarantees that element of social solidarity and control which is *indispensable* to progress. This it was which the proposed system of Dionysius the Areopagite lacked, and which all forms of individual "mysticism," so-called, lack.

"The *ecclesia*, the meeting, the gathering together, the congregation has a far higher importance than for the mere purpose of unity in an outward function. It is the means by which the most potent agent in religious life, collective suggestion, is brought to bear upon the mind." (Brinton, *Religs. of Prim. Peoples*, p. 178)

As to the serious practical problem of uniting Catholic and Protestant once more in the observance of the historic religious rites, my own conviction is that if we can get away from "petrified history" and back to *living* history we shall realize that it is the actual effects that the sacraments produce which constitute their certificate of validity and worth.

Probably the "astral" number of seven sacraments will not satisfy the requirements, but we shall need a sacred rite to help us through the social climaxes of life, as they occur. (On the psychological value of a "retreat" at times of physiological crises, *vide* Marrett, *op. cit.*, pp. 194 ff.)

Baptism of infants is no longer opposed even by the Baptists, who have come to realize that it supplies a distinct need. Christian children are *born* into the Church, and this fact should find its social expression. But for adults who have not grown up *in the Church*—and alas their number is great—another and different rite is needed. It must rest upon a conviction of faith, and provide for the reality of a "conversion" to a new life. But for children who are brought up under Christian nurture, no catacylsmic conversion can be natural, nor should it be provoked. It is for such as these that Confirmation is intended, and it supplies an opportunity to come, through a real emotional experience to a conviction of Christian "selfhood." If the

mark of Cain. It led to science and the arts but it led *away from God*.[25] The break from the "blessed community"[26] could lead to but one end—the ultimate disruption of the group solidarity. But this result does not follow immediately. On the contrary, it manifests itself gradually, and in two different types of "independence." The one is the total rejection of religion; the other the rejection of all social restraint in religion, and the profession of the Mystic, that "all is God and God is all." To-day, however, science is laying its benumbing and relentless grasp upon the very "mystic union" itself, declaring it to be but the result of misguided ignorance and self-imposed deception. The only

truth be told, the Catholic Church has never worked out this problem of the transition from adult to infant baptism, and the consequent separation of the official reception into the Church at the hands of the Bishop, from the purification of renouncing the old life of disobedience. It is just here that the chief quarrel between Protestant or Congregational and Presbyterian systems and the Episcopal form of government is the most serious.

Anointing with oil no longer has any place in daily life, and for this reason its symbolism has been lost. And our knowledge of disease makes any rite of healing of little value in most cases, but the effect upon the patient in nervous disorders should not be overlooked. Confession and Marriage are both of them sadly needed as the means of conferring strength to live consistent Christian lives.

When the Church shall be reunited, and disagreeable matters which affect our strongest sentiments, such as those relating to the authority to minister in the Church, have been settled,—*when* this comes, I say,—the centralization of the chief authority in the presiding officer, whether he be *called* Bishop or not, and the possession by a minister, of a certificate of eligibility, valid throughout the whole of Christendom, will be as natural as the office of President on any Board of Directors, or the holding of a degree from any university or a certificate from a State Board of Health.

[25] Genesis 4: 16-21.

[26] *cf.* Royce, J., *The Problem of Christianity*, (N. Y., 1913), II. 57-105.

refuge for the individual is to cast himself back on the bosom of the "community" which gave him birth. This does not mean that each individual is not to continue to be forever responsible for his own acts, but that as he is dependent upon the community for the moral standards by which he is judged, so also shall he be dependent upon the community for the moral dynamic which can enable him to live up to the responsibilities which the community lays upon him. This strength and support the Church was founded to supply, and it does so, through the ministration of the Sacraments.

"The method of science is a method of limitation. A purely natural science is of necessity excluded from the study of spiritual laws.[27] But it would be a mistake to conclude from this that the *facts* of spirit and those subject to natural inquiry are contained in mutually exclusive spheres. It is a notion like this which constitutes a grave danger for spiritual thought. There has been a tendency among those who believe in spirit, in freedom, in will, and personality, to speak as if the advance of the observed range of natural law was a menace to the kingdom of freedom; as if the place of freedom began where law was left behind, so that it became the interest of those who believe in freedom to keep back the advancing waves of manifest law. (The advance is, of course, the advance of a *manifestation,* for the law itself is now what it must always have been.) That notion haunts

---

[27] The most striking proof of this is the "behaviorist movement" in psychology. Watson says: "The consideration of the mind-body problem affects neither the type of problem selected nor the formulation of the solution of that problem." (*op. cit.* p. 9); "Psychology, as the behaviorist views it, is a purely objective, experimental branch of natural science which needs introspection as little as do the sciences of chemistry and physics. * * * In this sense consciousness may be said to be the instrument or tool with which all scientists work. Whether or not the tool is properly used at present by scientists is a problem for philosophy and not for psychology." (*ibid.* 27).

the minds of many people who believe in God, or who believe in man; and consequently it has been accepted and absorbed by men upon the other side. The other side has seen an enemy in the name of freedom as if it challenged the integrity of law. * * * * On the contrary, freedom never has its chance excepting in so far as the free person not only is existing under a system of law, but has discovered its nature, and so is able to lay hands upon its advantages." [28]

Perhaps the most powerful influence in the realm of educated thought to-day is what we may call a special outgrowth of the theory of evolution. I mean the "biological point of view." Wherever you turn you find the impress of biological thinking, and it has become trite to speak of society as an "organism." [29] The Church's time honored terminology which referred to the Christian Community as the "Body of Christ" was meant to teach this very truth, but its significance has now begun to be grasped anew and with deeper insight. And so it is that both from the weakness of disintegration which was almost an inevitable outcome of the growth of individualism, and from the pressure of scientific thought, come two powerful forces which drive Christian men to consider with more sympathy than has been the habit of the past three centuries, what there may be of value in the sacred rites commonly known as Sacraments. It seems to me that social psychology has gone a long way toward reveal-

[28] I have borrowed these words, which express my thought better than I could do in my own, from that excellent book by the Rev. Father Waggett, S. S. J. E., little known I fear outside of Anglican circles, entitled *The Scientific Temper in Religion.* (London, 1905).

[29] The single and fatal objection to this, except as a metaphor, is that science does not believe that organism can inherit *acquired characters*, while the single function which civilization fulfils is to make this *possible* for society. *Vide* another book by Fr. Waggett, *Religion and Science*, (Lond. 1909) esp. chap. 12: "Society Regarded as an Organism."

ing to us the positive value of religious rites as a means of social control, and the greatest need of our civilization today is for some means of controlling and reinforcing the moral conduct of its members,[30] such as the Sacraments supply. The sentiments and emotions of men are *beyond the reach of science,* on its own admission. History has manifestly demonstrated that for endless generations these same sentiments and emotions can resist the influence of intellectual development and cultural change. The only way to alter or to improve the customs and habits of the community is by creating a public opinion or sentiment which shall be able to reach them at their fountain and source in the emotions, the sentiments, the beliefs and the habits of the individual. It is to mould and direct all these and to pattern them after the type of Humanity set before us in the person of Jesus that the Sacraments of the Christian religion are intended. If God be revealed *anywhere* it is within the human heart! Man "knows that it is only in his own heart that the conviction can possibly be established; that if there is a root of communion with God it is a root planted in his own life, and that if there are outward facts which can, as it were, teach his heart how to spring, and point for him the direction in which to aim his venture after the unknown God, these facts must lie in the region of the nature which is like his own, in Human Nature." [31]

---

[30] "If a state can develop a system which permits to the individual a free play of effort and character, which gives him freedom and a copious life with no consciousness of a commanding influence forcing him, and yet stands beside the weaker elements in its organization and gives them conditions preservative of their strength and well being, it may have found its stability and be proof against internal rot and strong against attack from without." (*The Chicago Sunday Tribune*, July 25, 1915: Editorial)

[31] Waggett, P. N. *Scientific Temper*, pp. 242-243. The conclusion to which these words there lead is to the Humanity of Jesus, but I venture to apply them to the Sacraments, which are

To-day we are in a better position than ever before to realize that science and religion do not move in the same realm, though they both deal with the same facts. As we look out upon the universe we discover in it signs of mechanical process and signs of moral freedom, both of them subject, so far as we can discover, to certain definite laws. What these laws are we are slowly discovering after much patient experiment and investigation, and psychology has shown us some of the laws of the activity of man's subjective life which we call his "soul." When man approaches the majesty of the unknown, believing himself to be in the presence of God, he assumes an attitude of humble trust, and seeks to enter into that personal relationship which we call communion, or oneness of spirit.

Underlying this attitude of changed relationship, which has occupied so much of our discussion, there is a very real psychic experience, which we have referred to as either catharsis or ecstacy. The "thrill" of the solemn religious rite results from the fact that the whole of the present social group is "of one mind" and the removal of all sense of adverse judgment or conflicting opinion, produces, by the action of what we call psychic laws, the consciousness of purification and exaltation which constitutes the "reality" of the effect, to which experience testifies. [32]

It is because of the demonstrable facts here set forth, that Christian experience throughout the ages has insisted on the "supernatural" value of the Sacraments.

---

often spoken of as an "extension of the Incarnation." *vide.* Wilberforce, S., *The Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Lon. 1879), p. 275.

[32] "Against the critical arguments, advanced against religion in the name of natural science, other arguments may be arrayed; and if they are strong enough they will avail eventually to make in the mind a clear field and no favor. But upon this clear field, after the antecedent prejudices have disappeared, conviction can only arise by the acquisition of positive proofs drawn from the world of spiritual fact." (Waggett, *ut supra*, 231-232.)

INDEX